

the future for construction in the State of Wyoming be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend pensions of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal unemployment tax and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to permit the naturalization of all peoples without regard to race or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Russell A. DeLong; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of John J. Franklin, James H. Bradford, William M. Orr Co., and Alex Maier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3352. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Michael Kroskof-Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 3353. A bill to authorize the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to John T. Norman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of John E. Paradisss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3355. A bill for the relief of Albina Bucewich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

176. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain jurisdiction of the land management of the public domain in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

177. Also, memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future for construction

in the State of Wyoming be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

178. Also, memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

179. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging Congress to amend the Federal unemployment tax and the Internal Revenue Code and to enact legislation to permit 100 percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by the States and return to the States full power over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

180. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the city council of Fall River, Mass., urging the designation of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

181. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging amendment of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100 percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over administration of unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

182. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Senate Joint Memorial 6, requesting that Congress appropriate necessary funds and proceed at once with the early and speedy construction of the Pallsade Dam project in Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

183. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John C. Burt, New York, N. Y., protesting against the rent and eviction control laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

184. Also, petition of Carl V. E. Cassel, D. D. S., secretary, Minnesota State Dental Association, St. Paul, Minn., opposing the enactment of any bill containing the principle of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, the source from which we come, the goal to which we travel, the light and strength of these, our pilgrim days: We turn for this quiet moment from converse with our fellows to commune with Thee. Grant us for our hallowing thoughts that pass into prayer, prayers that pass into love, love that passes into life. In Thee is the secret of every virtue we possess and every victory won, and every thought of holiness. Enter into our lives this day and make them Thine. Redeem them from fear and frustration, equip and empower them by Thy heavenly grace, that they may be adequate for all the varied duties and responsibilities that confront these Thy servants entrusted with the authority of government. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT ON CREDIT OPERATIONS TO CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing credit operations to certain Indians, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT ON EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

A letter from the Executive Secretary of the National Munitions Control Board, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report covering the exportation and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, for the period January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask permission to be absent from the Senate during the remainder of the week, beginning at 6 o'clock this evening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Eastland	Holland
Baldwin	Eaton	Hunt
Brewster	Ellender	Ives
Bricker	Ferguson	Jenner
Bridges	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Frear	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	Fulbright	Johnson, S. C.
Cain	George	Kefauver
Capehart	Gillette	Kerr
Chapman	Green	Kilgore
Chavez	Gurney	Knowland
Connally	Hayden	Langer
Cordon	Hendrickson	Lodge
Donnell	Hickenlooper	Long
Douglas	Hill	Lucas
Downey	Hoey	

McCarran  
McCarthy  
McClellan  
McFarland  
McGrath  
McKellar  
McMahon  
Magnuson  
Malone  
Martin  
Maybank  
Miller  
Millikin  
Morse  
Mundt

Murray  
Myers  
Neely  
O'Connor  
O'Mahoney  
Pepper  
Reed  
Robertson  
Russell  
Saltonstall  
Schoeppel  
Smith, Maine  
Sparkman  
Stennis  
Taft

Taylor  
Thomas, Okla.  
Thomas, Utah  
Thye  
Tobey  
Tydings  
Vandenberg  
Watkins  
Wherry  
Wiley  
Williams  
Withers  
Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered for their names, a quorum is present.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators desiring to incorporate matters in the Appendix of the Record, to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, or present for the RECORD other matters usually presented during the morning hour, be permitted to do so without debate, and without prejudicing the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object to the request—I wish, without seeming to be presumptuous, to ask the distinguished majority leader if it is his intention to request the approval of the Journal.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall make such a request when the pending unanimous-consent request has been acted upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, some of us did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Illinois is that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions and present routine matters as has been done at the beginning of each session for several days. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal from February 25 up to and including yesterday be approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have not yet had an opportunity to study the Journal. Therefore I feel constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, protesting against the enactment of legislation to per-

mit the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GURNEY on March 8, 1949, p. 1962 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GURNEY on March 8, 1949, p. 1962 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the west coast during World War II was vital to the defense of the entire United States; and

"Whereas this defense required the construction of large airports and extensive facilities for the operation of long-range aircraft and for the training of large numbers of air force personnel at strategic locations in Oregon; and

"Whereas these strategic airport and training facilities must be maintained so that our western defense front is held in a state of readiness; and

"Whereas the maintenance of these strategic airports is beyond the capacity of the present finances of the municipalities affected; and

"Whereas the Oregon cities owning these strategic airports are faced with increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized, and this forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon hereby does petition the Congress to make available funds for the purpose of maintaining, on a defense standard, the airports and facilities which have been either constructed or taken over by the armed forces and which are of primary strategic value to said forces; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative therein, representing the people of the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate February 9, 1949.

"WM. E. WALSH,

"President of Senate.

"Concurred in by house February 25, 1949.

"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,

"Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation to amend and broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act

"Whereas there still remain inequalities in our social-security system which require readjustment to assure a fuller life for all our citizens; and

"Whereas there are over 20,000,000 Americans still excluded from the benefits provided by the National Social Security Act; and

"Whereas, in view of the increased cost of living, present provisions are inadequate to

provide our elderly citizens with a decent standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to enact legislation for the extension of the Social Security Act of all deserving Americans not otherwise so protected, and broadening social security to provide an increase in aid for elderly citizens; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,

"Speaker of the House.

"GEORGE BURKE,

"President of the Senate.

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,

"Governor."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States of America to retain jurisdiction of the land management of the public domain in the Department of the Interior

"Whereas the Department of the Interior of the United States has been the custodial agent of the public-domain lands of this Nation since the foundation of the Republic; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior, as the managerial agent of the public domain, has performed its functions in a creditable manner; and

"Whereas the functions of the Department of the Interior in the continental United States are confined almost entirely to the public-land States, and said Department has generally shown a sympathetic interest in the problems of the Western States, as was evidenced by the prompt, efficient, and diligent manner in which the Department of the Interior assisted the people of this State and of the West in opening roads and trails during the current storm disaster; and

"Whereas it is reliably reported that the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Departments of the Government, has recommended that the functions of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, except as to minerals, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas such recommendation, if adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and approved by the President of the United States, will strike a mortal blow to the welfare of the people of the West: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring), That the President of the United States and both Houses of the Congress of the United States be memorialized to oppose said recommendation of the Hoover Commission; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"GEORGE BURKE,

"President of the Senate.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,

"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,

"Governor."

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future, for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has had many years of, and the only, experience in initiation, construction, maintenance and development of all Federal irrigation projects in the West and in such matters has been and is required by laws of the Nation, to comply with all affecting State laws; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirtieth Wyoming Legislature (its house of representatives concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States be and they are hereby memorialized, to promptly and effectively enact such legislation as may be appropriate to vest in said Bureau beyond any possibility of judicial doubt or executive direction concerning congressional intent, continued and direct supervision of the initiation, construction, maintenance, and development of all Federal irrigation projects wholly or partially within the State of Wyoming, now or in the future proposed, consistent with objectives of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, and opposed to objectives of such plans as the Columbia Valley Authority and Missouri Valley Authority; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of the United States Congress and to the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable LESTER C. HUNT, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively in said Congress, from Wyoming

"GEORGE BURKE,

"President of the Senate.

"HERMAN D. MAYLAND,

"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 25, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,

"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to permit naturalization of all peoples without regard to race or national origin

"Whereas the United States of America stands today as the champion of the equality of men before the law without regard to race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas the recognition of the fact that we are all members of one world and that men are individuals to be valued as such without regard to the color of their skins has been recognized in the change of the naturalization law of America permitting Chinese, Filipinos, and East Indians formerly barred by their racial antecedents to the privilege of citizenship; and

"Whereas the outmoded naturalization law still denies citizenship to Japanese, Koreans, Indonesians, Siamese, Samoans, and Guamanians: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is respectfully urged to enact legislation permitting naturalization of all peoples without regard to race or national origin; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to

the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 180

"Joint resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to locate a surplus Navy floating drydock at Wilmington for preservation of bottoms of Maritime Commission-owned merchant marine fleet laid up in Brunswick River

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this General Assembly that the United States Congress is giving consideration to providing drydocks for the purpose of inspection and giving primary preservative treatment to vessel hulls of the Maritime Commission reserve fleets; and

"Whereas there are approximately 425 vessels of the Maritime Commission's merchant fleet now laid up in Brunswick River at Wilmington to be inspected and given such preservative treatment as the United States Maritime Commission decides essential; and

"Whereas the servicing of the Wilmington fleet by means other than a floating drydock at the lay-up basin, will involve excessive towage charges to the nearest commercial drydocks, located at Hampton Roads, Va., and Charleston, S. C., and will be an inefficient and uneconomical method of preserving the hulls of said vessels; and

"Whereas the United States Maritime Commission recognizes that greater efficiency and larger material savings can be effectuated by having said vessels serviced at the places where they are laid up and has recommended that floating drydocks be provided for the servicing of such vessels: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the United States Congress are requested and urged to give favorable consideration to, and take favorable action on, the recommendations of the United States Maritime Commission to provide floating drydocks to service the hulls of ships of the reserve fleets of said Commission at the places where they are now laid up.

"SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives' Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and to each Member of Congress from the State of North Carolina.

"SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

"In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 2d day of March 1949.

"H. P. TAYLOR,

"President of the Senate.

"KERR CRAIG RAMSAY,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial by the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend pensions of veterans of World War I

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas there are many veterans of World War I in the State of New Mexico who, as a result directly or indirectly of their military service in World War I, are no longer capable of full-time, gainful occupation; and

"Whereas many of said veterans of said World War I are suffering from disabilities, both service- and non-service connected, which incapacitate them from gainful employment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact legislation which will give to the veterans of World War I who have reached the age of 55 years a pension of not less than \$60 per month, and that all veterans of World War I suffering from non-service-connected disability be granted disability compensation based on the existing total amount of disability; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded respectively to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators of the State of New Mexico in the National Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation for the establishment of a separate united Pueblo Indian Administration

"Whereas there are various Pueblo Tribes of Indians within the State of New Mexico, who live on their own reservations and who have title to their own reservations as a tribe; and

"Whereas these Tribes of Pueblo Indians are only Pueblo Indians of their kind in the United States; and

"Whereas the problems of said Pueblo Tribes are peculiar to them and different from all other Indian Tribes in the United States; and

"Whereas in the past legislation applicable to other tribes has been applied to the Pueblo Indians of this State, without understanding the peculiar problems of said Pueblo Indians; and

"Whereas it appears that a separate administration would greatly benefit the Pueblo Indian Tribes and be beneficial to both the United States of America and the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico is particularly interested in the welfare of the said Pueblo Indian Tribes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact legislation that will provide for the establishment of a United Pueblo Administration for the State of New Mexico, at the head of which shall be an administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; said United Pueblo Administration to be separate and apart from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; to exercise its powers and duties under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the Interior; and the principal office of which to be within the State of New Mexico.

"SEC. 2. And be it further resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to each of New Mexico's Representatives and Senators in Congress, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States to immediately go on record as favoring the specific mention of rheumatic diseases in the National Service Foundation bill now before the Congress of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas from a survey made by the United State Public Health Service on the social and

economic significance among chronic diseases in the United States; rheumatism ranked first in prevalence and second in producing disability and invalidism; and

"Whereas 6,850,000 of our people are plagued by this disease and 147,000 of them each year become permanently invalidated to join that large army of isolated prisoners; and

"Whereas a large number of our comrades are among those sufferers and permanent invalids who cry out for relief from their agony; and

"Whereas we, a democratic organization, believe we can best help our comrades by helping our whole citizenry in need of such service, by a research program such as the Government-subsidized National Service Foundation bill now before the United States Congress to promote research in medicine, physics, biology, national defense, and other fields: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the President of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to take immediate and proper action as has been resolved by national conventions of the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars by going on record as favoring the specific mention of rheumatic diseases in the National Service Foundation bill, as is cancer and heart disease so mentioned, and to request the Congress of the United States to take immediate action.*

*"Approved by me this 2d day of March 1949.*

*"THOMAS J. MAERY,*

*"Governor, State of New Mexico."*

A resolution adopted by the Niagara (Wis.) Grange, favoring a Federal support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by J. W. Steele, treasurer, Woodford County Farm Bureau, Versailles, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a 90 percent parity support price by the Government be continued on all farm crops under quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the American Warehousemen's Association, Washington, D. C., relating to Government ownership, price controls, wages, and so forth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of Arthur Post, chairman, New York Hotel Tenants League, of New York, N. Y., and sundry other citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by Dr. Maurice Heck, E. E. Branscome, and S. G. Gilman, the Publicity Committee, Florida Apartment House Association, Miami, Fla., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to continue rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by A. L. Haugen, chairman, National Service Committee, Renton (Wash.) Kiwanis Club, praying for the enactment of legislation to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on streamlining the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Valent Bizuk, chairman, American Liberation Committee for Spis and Orava, Chicago, Ill., relating to the treatment of the Slovak people (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Wolfe Tone Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, the Bronx, N. Y., relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and others; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, the Methodist Federation for Social Action,

New York, relating to communism and the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Fall River, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Dewie J. Gaul and J. J. Comiskey, Jr., of Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of the McMahon-Johnson bill, granting aid to private-school students; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Minnesota State Dental Association, of St. Paul, Minn., and the Lions Club, in the State of Idaho, protesting against enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of Samuel Caplan, secretary, American Jewish Congress, of New York, N. Y., and Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, praying for a change in the Senate rules to provide cloture; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Missouri State Council of Machinists, in conference assembled at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law; ordered to lie on the table.

#### PROTEST AGAINST TRIAL AND CONVICTION OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Senate of Maryland, protesting the trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist-dominated Government of Hungary.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. TYDINGS on March 8, 1949, p. 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

#### AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS—RESOLUTION OF UTAH LEGISLATURE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I present a letter from the secretary of state of Utah enclosing a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Utah, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 246, granting \$300,000,000 in aid of public schools, and I ask unanimous consent that they be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF UTAH,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Salt Lake City, March 4, 1949.

The Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS,  
The United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am requested by the Legislature of the State of Utah and have the honor to transmit to you herewith a copy of House Resolution No. 5, passed by the Legislature of the State of Utah on March 3, 1949, entitled "A Resolution Memorializing the United States Congress To Pass S. 246 Granting \$300,000,000 in Aid of the Public Schools."

Yours very respectfully,

HEBER BENNION, Jr.,  
Secretary of State.

#### House Resolution 5

Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to pass S. 246 granting \$300,000,000 in aid of the public schools

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah:

Whereas public education is the strongest single force for the preparation of skilled producers and informed citizens; and

Whereas the control of education is a State-local function but the support of education is a great, long-standing tradition shared by local, State, and Federal governments—a tradition older than the present Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government has for more than 150 years made grants in aid to education without taking the control of public education away from the State and local school boards; and

Whereas more than 50 great national organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Grange, American Farm Bureau, Farmers' Union, NAACP, CIO, A. F. of L. and educational organizations, as well as many others, urge Federal aid, without Federal control, to help finance public education; and

Whereas the social welfare of an individual is expressed throughout the entire population; and

Whereas education is considered the foundation of modern culture and civilization, and the responsibility necessarily belongs to everyone who is a part of that culture and civilization; and

Whereas only the Federal Government can equalize the opportunity for schooling of the Nation's children under conditions now prevailing: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Utah Legislature memorializes the United States Congress to pass S. 246 to provide \$300,000,000 to the public schools of the United States; be it further*

*Resolved, That the secretary of state send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each of the United States congressional delegation from the State of Utah.*

#### FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring an amendment to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100 percent credit against pay roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code to permit a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by States and to return to the States full control over the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws

Whereas the Federal Government now finances the entire cost of the State employment security operations of the several States having approved unemployment-compensation laws, although such a 100-percent Federal grant of funds to administer State laws does not exist elsewhere in the field of Federal grants-in-aid; and

Whereas under terms of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code the Federal Government levies a 3-percent pay-roll tax on defined employers against which tax these employers are given a maxi-

mun 90-percent credit, based on their contributions paid and experience rating credits earned; and the remaining 10 percent of the 3-percent tax, which is generally referred to as the three-tenths of 1 percent administrative expense tax, is not earmarked for the purposes for which it was originally intended, namely, for the expenses of the administration by the States of their unemployment-compensation laws and is not now being used in its entirety for such purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Government has collected by means of the said three-tenths of 1 percent administrative expense tax as of July 1, 1948, \$1,670,940,000, out of which sum the States have been granted approximately \$780,000,000 for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, leaving a Federal profit of approximately \$891,070,000; and

Whereas the Federal Government under the present law determines what sums of money shall be returned to the States for expenses to administer unemployment-compensation laws, although the States, having the responsibility to administer their own laws, should have the right in their own judgment to determine what sums of money are needed to administer their own laws; and because the present control over such funds by the Federal Government has exposed large numbers of employees of the Division of Employment Security of this Commonwealth to loss of employment, which threatens to impair the efficiency with which this law is now being administered; and

Whereas the 100-percent Federal grant instead of promoting good Federal-State relations has a tendency to injure them: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Internal Revenue Code and to enact legislation which will result in giving to employers a 100-percent credit against pay-roll taxes collected by the States, and giving to each State with an approved unemployment-compensation law the right and the power to expend from the receipts of the pay-roll tax levied upon employers as much as it deems necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its State law; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 25, 1949.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 2, 1949.

#### EXTENSION OF SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW— RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LYNN, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lynn, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to broaden the provisions of the social-security law, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas petitions will be filed with the Eighty-first Congress for changes in the social-security laws; and

Whereas social-security benefits should be increased to provide for the increased cost of living, and social-security coverage

extended so as to include many persons who should, in all fairness, be entitled to the benefits of same: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lynn*, That the Eighty-first Congress be urged to enact such legislation as to enable social-security benefits to be increased and social-security coverage extended while maintaining the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to United States Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., the Members of Congress from the Massachusetts districts, President Harry S. Truman, and the press.

#### EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—RESOLUTION OF ESSEX (MASS.) COUNTY COMMIS- SIONERS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the county commissioners of Essex County, Mass., favoring the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to incorporate therein provisions to prevent lowering of tariffs or establishing quotas to a point where American industry would be placed in jeopardy, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a bill pending before the United States Senate Finance Committee extending the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements; and

Whereas American industry must be protected against harmful foreign competition so as to prevent widespread unemployment and lowering of living standards; and

Whereas safeguards should be established by Congress to protect the shoe industry and all other industries in Essex County, textile industry in Lawrence and North Andover, fishing industry in Gloucester, leather industry in Peabody, hat industry in Amesbury, as all of these Essex County communities are highly dependent upon these industries; and

Whereas the county commissioners of Essex County approve the Economic Cooperation Administration program, and endorse the policy of encouraging international trade as a means to help relieve suffering and distressed peoples throughout the world so as to enhance the chances of world peace and calculated to prevent the spread of communism: Be it

*Resolved*, That Congress be urged in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to incorporate therein provisions to prevent lowering of tariffs or establishing quotas to a point where American industry would be placed in jeopardy and to include the so-called escape clause to further safeguard against mistakes in judgment and such further restrictions as may be necessary to enable the President to fulfill his assurance to the American public that reciprocal-trade agreements program will not injure domestic producers; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Senators Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Leverett Saltonstall, Congressmen Edith Nourse Rogers, George J. Bates, Thomas J. Lane, Angier L. Goodwin, President Harry S. Truman, Gov. Paul A. Dever, the press, and copy spread upon the records.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: S. 969. A bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 102).

#### STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF CLOSING OF TEXTILE MILLS—REPORT OF IN- TERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 101)

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted a report on the study and investigation of the closing of American textile mills and the operations of Textron, Inc., which was ordered to be printed.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 9, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a portion of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

David J. Coddalre, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Joseph F. Farley, and sundry other officers and persons for promotion and appointment in the United States Coast Guard and United States Coast Guard Reserve;

Gordon L. Bates, and several other officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard, and Samuel R. Early, to be ensign in the United States Coast Guard; and

Lorin F. Woodcock to be lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1210. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Chloe

Ford Riley a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 1211. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Cheyenne River Compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Carlton Hotel, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1213. A bill for the relief of Nicholas J. Manticas and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1214. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1215. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Martin Creek at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1216. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of Abraham Trattler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**USE OF CERTAIN MERCHANT VESSELS FOR TEMPORARY TRANSOCEANIC PASSENGER SERVICE**

Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MUNDT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 83), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the Congress has by the act of August 1, 1946 (Public Law 584, 79th Cong.), the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), and the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.) encouraged travel by American citizens in countries participating in the European recovery program and the interchange between the United States and foreign countries of students and other persons traveling for educational or cultural purposes; and

Whereas it has become evident, because of the shortage of accommodations for passengers in transoceanic shipping, that many students and other persons desiring to travel to foreign countries for educational or cultural purposes during the coming travel season are going to be unable to do so unless additional transoceanic passenger shipping accommodations at reasonable rates are made available in the near future; and

Whereas the United States Government owns certain merchant vessels which are now laid up but which could readily be returned to active service and outfitted for the transoceanic transportation of passengers; and

Whereas it is believed that the executive branch of the Government is possessed of adequate legal powers to enable it to return such vessels to active service and outfit them for the transoceanic transportation of passengers: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the President is requested to provide, through such departments and agencies of the Government as he may deem appropriate, for the return to active service and the outfitting for transoceanic transportation of passengers of such number of laid-up merchant vessels of the United States as may be required to provide accommodations, at rates reflecting costs to

the United States, for the travel to and from foreign countries during the period May 1, 1949, to November 1, 1949, of approximately 7,500 American students and other citizens desiring to travel abroad for educational or cultural purposes. The President is further requested to utilize any vessels so returned to active service for the transportation to the United States, during the time that such vessels are not being used for the return travel of American students and other citizens, of displaced persons at such rates of fare as may be prescribed after negotiations with the International Refugee Organization.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BROUGHTON

Mr. HOEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 84), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. J. Melville Broughton, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### MEMORIAL TO UNKNOWN SOLDIER OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That the President is requested to cause the United States Representatives to the United Nations to recommend to it that there be erected, at its permanent headquarters, a memorial which (1) shall be known as the United Nations Unknown Serviceman Memorial; and (2) shall mark the burial place of a member of the armed forces of a member nation, chosen by lot in a fitting manner, and so as not to identify the nation of his allegiance, from among the unknown dead of World War II.

#### ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. O'CONOR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States express its great concern over the threat to our Nation's security which might arise out of unrestricted activities of foreign agents serving with secretariats or delegations of international organizations which have their official residence within the United States; and that it is the sense of the Senate that the Department of State and the Department of Justice should (A) in the exercise of authority heretofore conferred by law, take action at the earliest practicable date, in agreement with appropriate international organizations, to conclude such arrangements governing the entry, conduct, and activities of members and employees of such secretariats and delegations from foreign countries as may be necessary to prevent occurrences prejudicial to the safety and interests of the United States; and (B) in the event that existing statutory authority is inadequate to accomplish such object, to prepare and submit to the Congress at the earliest possible time, such proposed legislation as may be required therefor.

#### AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JENNER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic

Cooperation Act of 1948, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ASSISTANCE TO BLIND VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 807) authorizing financial assistance to blind veterans of World War II in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

#### NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN—LETTERS, TELEGRAMS, AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several newspaper comments, telegrams, and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know something about the contents of these letters. If they are the same type of letters as those introduced the other day into the RECORD by the Senator from Washington, I certainly am going to object.

Mr. CAIN. Would the Senator from Illinois permit the junior Senator from Washington to read only what I ask permission to submit for the RECORD in order that the Senator from Illinois and other Senators can consider the validity of the character of the comments?

Mr. LUCAS. I am constrained to interpose an objection if the Senator does not tell me that these letters are different from the type he introduced into the RECORD the other day. If they are the same type of letters I must object.

Mr. CAIN. I may say, Mr. President, to the Senator from Illinois, that each of the letters, each of the telegrams, and each of the editorial comments has been written by individual American citizens. The author of each document is not writing a similar letter or anything similar to what is written by others. It is the desire of the authors to write to a United States Senator, and it has only been his wish to submit their views for the RECORD in order that they may be considered by whoever wants to look at them.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have plenty of time, when Mr. Wallgren's nomination comes up for consideration, to read the type of scurrilous and scandalous letters he put into the RECORD the other day. I therefore object.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois objects.

#### THE CRITICAL IRON ORE SITUATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared, urging an investigation of the critical iron ore situation facing the Nation. I have made this suggestion in a letter which I have sent to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In the letter I pointed out that one of the most critical shortages facing our Nation's industrial economy and plaguing our defense plans is the lack of adequate reserves of high-grade iron ore.

I feel that if we can get an investigation under way on this problem, we will be taking the first step to a solution of a matter affecting not only America's future but the future of the western world, which depends upon United States steel production for its very survival.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

#### NEED FOR INVESTIGATION OF CRITICAL IRON ORE SITUATION BY SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE

This statement concerns one of the most critical problems facing our Nation's defense planners—the depletion of American iron ore reserves. It is a problem on which we, as Americans, have been bumbling and stumbling along, virtually blind, virtually heedless of the danger confronting us. We have ignored the problem almost completely. We—military men and civilians alike—have sat back on our haunches in a pre-Pearl-Harbor-like stupor. The time has come to awaken on it, and that is the purpose of these remarks—to sound an alarm so to speak, just as others have begun to toll the bells to warn our country of the danger. Uncle Joe is laughing at us, I am sure, in our lack of concern over this danger. The time has come to look at reality and to act.

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS OF THIS PROBLEM

A year ago in connection with this debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, I brought this subject to the attention of the Senate, pointing out the imminent exhaustion of the iron ore resources in the Middle West. At that time, there was some skepticism expressed by a number of my colleagues. I can well understand this, since the facts were not generally known at that time. Since then, however, the facts have been coming out gradually. The iron and steel industry itself has become much concerned about this situation, and has been engaged in a variety of activities to find substitute sources of iron ore. The most recent exhaustive study of this situation appeared in the magazine, *Iron Age*, of January 6. I commend this article to the careful attention of my colleagues. A few days ago, I wrote to our able colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this subject.

Let me read an introductory note by W. A. Lloyd, Cleveland regional editor of the *Iron Age*. Mr. Lloyd says in introducing this subject:

"The reign of the fabulous Mesabi is ending—1960, perhaps earlier, will see the end. United States dependency upon foreign ore is a reality. How and when this Mesabi tonnage will be replaced is told in this objective survey of the steel industry's No. 1 problem."

The study itself, which I am recommending to the attention of the Senate, was prepared for the *Iron Age* magazine by Dr. John W. Gruner of the Department of Geology and Mineralogy, University of Minnesota.

#### NEED FOR INTERIOR COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

I consider this situation so serious that in the afore-mentioned letter to my industrious colleague, the senior Senator of Wyoming, I have respectfully requested that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has been making a study of natural resources, initiate a thorough inquiry into the iron ore situation and the alternative methods of meeting the requirements of the iron and steel industry in the foreseeable future. This

is one subject that we cannot improvise from day to day, as it will take years to develop substitute sources for the Mesabi Range. It is, in my view, the No. 1 problem of national security, since without the secure foundation of the iron and steel industry, our capacity to mobilize will be seriously weakened; indeed, the capacity of the western world will be threatened.

#### WHERE ARE WE GOING TO GET THE ORE?

There is a great deal of confusion as to where our country is going to find adequate supplies of ore after the Mesabi resources are exhausted. The average annual shipments from the Lake Superior region have been 80,000,000 tons of ore a year during the past 8 years. Much of this has come from open-pit mines. When these are exhausted, new supplies will have to be provided from other sources. Some students of the subject glibly assert that we can get all we want from low-grade ores. Others claim that it will be impractical economically and physically to get 80,000,000 or even 60,000,000 tons of ore from low-grade taconite. In fact, those who are actively engaged in the development of low-grade ores anticipate no more than 20,000,000 tons from this source by 1964. Where is the country going to secure the rest of the necessary ore supplies to make up the total of 80,000,000 or more tons needed? Unless this question is settled, there will be a real danger that part of the iron and steel industry in the Middle West will gradually move away to the coastal areas in order to take advantage of foreign ores. This cannot be beneficial to the country either in peace or in war, it will mean further suicidal industrial centralization of the type that I have been warning against for years.

#### COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

This is such a vital problem that we must have a comprehensive national program worked out in cooperation with industry. And I feel certain that when such an overall program is worked out on an economical basis that it will provide for the continued utilization of the present ore mines; it will provide for the development of taconite up to the maximum of its economical and technological capacity; and it will also provide for the importation of substantial amounts of ore from outside sources (i. e., from Labrador and elsewhere) into the Middle Western mills.

I, therefore, respectfully call upon the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a thorough and impartial study of this subject.

#### TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CUT-BACK IN VETERANS' HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the tentative schedule of public hearings before a special subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the proposed cut-back in veterans' hospital construction program.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CUT-BACK IN VETERANS' HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A special subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, composed of Senator PEPPER, chairman, Senator HUMPHREY, and Senator MORSE, will hold public hearings to investigate the proposed curtailment of the veterans' hospital construction program and to determine the need for additional facilities and the availability of doc-

tors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel to staff such facilities.

Under an Executive order of the President, the Veterans' Administration plans to cancel the construction of 24 new hospitals and to reduce the size of 14 others—a total of 16,000 beds. The States in which such cancellations and reductions are to take effect are as follows: California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee will conduct public hearings daily, except Sundays, from 10 a. m. until 12 noon, beginning Thursday, March 10, in the committee hearing room, P-26, in the Capitol Building.

All witnesses scheduled to appear before the subcommittee are instructed to submit 75 copies of their prepared testimony to the office of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, room 42, Capitol Building, at least 72 hours in advance of their scheduled appearance. Witnesses are to present only a brief oral summary of their prepared testimony at the time of their appearance and should be prepared to answer any questions raised by the members of the subcommittee during the balance of the time allotted to them. The tentative schedule of the public hearings follows:

Witnesses should note this schedule carefully in order that the hearings can be carried out without confusion or delay:

#### THURSDAY, MARCH 10

10 a. m. to 12 noon: Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

#### FRIDAY, MARCH 11

10 a. m. to 10:30 a. m.: United States Army.  
10:30 a. m. to 11 a. m.: United States Navy.  
11 a. m. to 11:30 a. m.: United States Public Health Service.  
11:30 a. m. to 12 noon: Regular Veterans' Association, American Hospital Association.

#### MONDAY, MARCH 14

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Disabled American veterans.  
11 a. m. to 12 noon: AMVETS.

#### TUESDAY, MARCH 15

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: American veterans' committee.  
11 a. m. to 12 noon: Veterans' Administration.

#### WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: California—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.  
11 a. m. to 12 noon: Florida—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

#### THURSDAY, MARCH 17<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Georgia—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

<sup>1</sup>In order to facilitate the presentation of testimony to the subcommittee, it will be necessary to arrange for the testimony of the State service officers and the representatives of the State and local veterans' organizations to be presented jointly in the form of panel discussions. This means that all State service officers and representatives of State and local veterans' organizations of a given State will testify together at the same time on the same day. Following the panel discussions for each State, the testimony of the State medical association and the public agencies of that State will be presented. This means that all testimony bearing upon the problems of a particular State will be concluded on the same day and appear consecutively in the record.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Illinois—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

FRIDAY, MARCH 18<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Kentucky—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Michigan—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

SATURDAY, MARCH 19<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Minnesota—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Mississippi—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

MONDAY, MARCH 21<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Missouri—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: New York—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

TUESDAY, MARCH 22<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: North Carolina—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Ohio—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Oklahoma—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Oregon—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

THURSDAY, MARCH 24<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Pennsylvania—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: South Carolina—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

FRIDAY, MARCH 25<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Tennessee—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

11 a. m. to 12 noon: Texas—State service officers, State and local veterans' organizations, State medical association, State public agencies.

SATURDAY, MARCH 26<sup>1</sup>

10 a. m. to 11 a. m.: Washington, D. C.—District service officers, District veterans' or-

ganizations, District medical association, District public agencies.

#### COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES— STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, March 9, 1949, relating to Senate Joint Resolution 2, the proposed constitutional amendment to change the method of counting the electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES— STATEMENT OF BASIL BREWER

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, on Senate Joint Resolution 2, to change the method of counting the electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT— STATEMENT BY DR. LOUISE POUND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the equal-rights amendment by Dr. Louise Pound, professor at Nebraska University, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IMPORTATION OF JAPANESE FABRICS— ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Embargo Is Sought on Japan's Fabrics," and an article entitled "Knit Glove Protest Due," published in the New York Times of March 9, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION—LETTER FROM FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Francis M. Sullivan regarding the establishment of a war-claims commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE FILIBUSTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) EVENING NEWS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Filibuster," published in the March 7, 1949, issue of the Newark (N. J.) Evening News. The editorial, in discussing the filibuster, sets forth certain fundamental principles which the President of the United States and Members of this body can well afford to read and reflect upon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE FILIBUSTER

Given enough books, reports, and clippings and the manpower and physical stamina to read them into the record, a willful minority in the United States Senate can bring the legislative machinery of the Nation to a standstill. The parliamentary deadlock thus achieved is known as a filibuster. How long a well-organized filibuster endures depends more on the ability of the majority to take it than upon the capacity of the minority to keep it going.

The evil of the filibuster is that it not only delays action on the measure under debate but that it prevents action on all measures. When successful, it imposes the will of the minority upon the majority, and in so doing is held to be alien and inimical to the democratic process.

But the filibuster is not without defenders, some of whom abhor, as in the present civil-rights case, the causes for which it has been invoked. At its theoretical best the filibuster has been defended as a brake on legislation which might otherwise be enacted hastily, in the heat of passion, a spirit of reprisal, or for some transient, partisan gain.

A man so far removed from southern sympathies as Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan) last year was forced to rule against his own party in the fight to apply cloture to the anti-poll-tax fight. He recognized the weaknesses of the existing Senate rules, but he also called the filibuster the last legislative sanctuary for minority rights. Yet as so often happens in practical application, theory is in sharp conflict with reality.

In the last 30 years the filibuster has been resorted to mainly by southern Senators to ward off antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation. And in the debate now begun in the Senate to simplify cloture, the filibuster is being used not for the protection of the minority but as an instrument to continue minority oppressions in the South.

The Democratic attempt to change the Senate rules is a culmination of the civil-rights fight begun in the Democratic National Convention. Administration leaders, resuming in Washington where they left off in Philadelphia, act with Mr. Truman's full sanction and encouragement. Presumably they also act with full recognition of the possible cost to the Presidential program, including such high priority legislation as the Taft-Hartley Act, and more crucial to more people, the extender for expiring (March 31) rent controls.

But the Democratic attempt to change the Senate rules, which depends for success on Republican aid, was given a serious set-back by Mr. Truman himself. At a press conference last week, he casually remarked that it should be possible to invoke cloture by a simple majority vote. The cost of this off-the-cuff observation could be the alienation of Republican Senators who, while they resent the uses to which the filibuster has been put, nevertheless are apprehensive that what the President intends is to crush minority rights by application of a ruthless gag rule. It was a tactical blunder by Mr. Truman, the result of which is to jeopardize success of the cloture fight and the enactment of a civil-rights bill.

#### AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. Lucas to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise with some reluctance to speak against the motion now before the Senate.

I have been a Member of the Senate only 2 months. On both sides of the aisle sit men with experience here far exceeding my own who believe sincerely that this resolution is worthy and essential and should be adopted.

I respect their sincerity, and I do not weigh their judgment lightly.

In this debate, however, we are asked to choose between the freedom to enact laws hastily and the freedom to speak. For me, there is no choice. I cannot embrace any freedom which demands, as the terms for its existence, the imprisonment of another and more precious freedom.

<sup>1</sup> In order to facilitate the presentation of testimony to the subcommittee, it will be necessary to arrange for the testimony of the State service officers and the representatives of the State and local veterans' organizations to be presented jointly in the form of panel discussions. This means that all State service officers and representatives of State and local veterans' organizations of a given State will testify together at the same time on the same day. Following the panel discussions for each State, the testimony of the State medical association and the public agencies of that State will be presented. This means that all testimony bearing upon the problems of a particular State will be concluded on the same day and appear consecutively in the record.

## CLOTURE NO HANDICAP TO ME

I am aware that the proponents of this resolution deny that their form of cloture would impede free speech. They only intend to prevent filibusters by limiting each Senator—if two-thirds of the Members desire to do so—to 1 hour on the floor to speak for or against a piece of legislation. Personally, that would rarely be a handicap or an affront to me. I can imagine few occasions—even now—when I would desire more than an hour of the Senate's time to present my views on most issues arising here.

But I would not knowingly imperil a moment of my freedom to speak. So, I refuse now to seek an authority over others which I would not yield myself.

It matters not, Mr. President, whether cloture permits Senators to speak 1 hour, 1 week, or 1 month. If this resolution is adopted, the bridle will be upon the tongues of all minorities, and no mouth is free, once the bit is in its mouth.

There is no such thing as a "reasonable limit" on free speech. Good intentions, gentle reforms, and reasonable limits have destroyed more freedoms than evil forces could ever do, and I fear that danger now. As a distinguished Senator from Missouri, Senator Reed, once said:

Cloture means the granting of a power. Whenever you grant a power, you must assume that the power will be exercised. So, when we discuss this proposed rule, we must do so in the light not of how it may be exercised so as to do no harm, but we must consider how it may be exercised to do harm.

Cloture is to the majority what filibuster is to the minority. Each is a device by which a group may try to achieve its goal in legislative deliberations. But the devices are not equals.

## CLOTURE—THE DEADLIEST WEAPON

A filibuster, at best, has no assurance of success; it is more prayer than promise, a last hope for a conscientious minority. Not so, cloture. It is perhaps, the deadliest weapon in the arsenal of parliamentary procedures. Once a majority is armed with that weapon, the majority can be—if it so chooses—beyond the laws and moral compulsion of such flimsy restraints as parliamentary courtesy and precedents.

Against this, a minority has no defense.

When I say minority, I do not limit the term to mean only the South. A peculiar and passing interlude in history has vested the defense of the filibuster in the South, but only temporarily. The filibuster is not a Southern creation; it belongs to all the Nation, and to all the minorities—racial, religious, political, economic, or otherwise—which make up this Nation. I can foresee unlimited situations in which some of the minority groups, which have for 10 years agitated so earnestly for the filibuster's abolition, would want, and would use if they could, the filibuster to defend their rights.

Mr. President, I realize that we of the South who speak here are accused of prejudice, that we are labeled in the folklore of American tradition as a prejudiced minority. I would point out, though, that prejudice is not a minority affliction: prejudice is most wicked and most harmful as a majority ailment, directed

against minority groups. Prejudice inflames, excites, exaggerates; prejudice, I think, has inflamed a majority outside the Senate against those of us who speak now, exaggerating the evil and intent of the filibuster. Until we are free of prejudice, then there will be a place in our system for the filibuster—for the filibuster is the last defense of reason, the sole defense of minorities who might be victimized by prejudice.

## A KING CAN DO NO WRONG

When we speak of minorities, though, we are answered with the argument that the will of the majority should prevail, and that it is in the American tradition that the majority should prevail. This is a commonplace fallacy. It is akin to the doctrine that "a king can do no wrong."

In this country, a majority may govern, but it does not rule. The genius of our constitutional and representative government is the multitude of safeguards provided to protect minority interests. On the legislative level, where the laws are written, the House of Representatives was so designed by the architects of our Constitution that virtually every valid sectional or local interest would, at least, have a guardian here to scrutinize each law which might be enacted. But those guardians, in most instances, have little time and few opportunities to give voice to their thoughts on the floor for the benefit of their own constituents, their colleagues, or the people of this country.

The citadel of this carefully planned protection of minority rights is the Senate. Here, Members must be somewhat older in years than in the House, their terms of office are longer, and the change in membership is deliberately less abrupt. As the House is designed to provide a reflection of the mood of the moment, the Senate is meant to reflect the continuity of the past—to preserve the delicate balance of justice between the majority's whims and the minority's rights.

## SENATE IS A BODY OF EQUALS

When we speak of majorities in the Senate—based solely on the numerical division of the Members—we speak in hollow terms. The Senate was conceived as a body of equals, with each of the States in the Union equally represented. Majority rule obviously did not underlie this concept. Here was a forum in which minorities—minorities of population or minorities of ideas—could stand on equal footing with the most overpowering majority.

Under this system, the 15,000,000 people of New York have no more votes in the Senate than the 110,000 people in Nevada. Does that imply any intent for the majority to reign supreme here? Certainly not; the implication is clearly contrary to the principle of the resolution sought to be brought before us. It would be folly to yield to New York the power to shut off the voice of Nevada; it would be a greater travesty upon justice to permit Nevada to invoke cloture against New York.

Let us look further at this theory of majority rule and the futility of its application to the Senate's procedures:

As has already been made plain by my colleagues on the Senate floor and in

committee hearings, the 14 New England, Middle Atlantic and East North Central States, with a population equivalent to 47.7 percent of the population of the United States, has less than 30 percent of the votes in the Senate of the United States. Under the present rules of the Senate requiring a two-thirds vote to effect cloture, all of the Senators from this group of States could not prevent cloture.

If Texas and California were added to this list, we would have a majority of all of the population of the United States represented in this Senate by only one-third of the Members of this body.

Let me name those States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Texas and California. Now, Mr. President, if, under the rules of the Senate, cloture should be invoked against the Senators from those States, it is clear that the will of the majority of the people of this country would most certainly be thwarted.

That would mean that the will of the majority of the Senators had prevailed, but it would not by any device of logic or argument mean that the will of the majority of the American public had prevailed.

## IN TERMS OF INCOME

Mr. President, I dislike to talk of freedom in terms of income, in terms of money, but in passing I cannot refrain from pointing out that measured by the latest percentages of collections of Internal Revenue, the 14 States, mentioned above, exclusive of Texas and California, contributed 60.9 percent of the total income received by the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

If the shoe were on the other foot, and if a revenue or appropriation measure were involved, I feel that the Senators from New York, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and the other States mentioned, would not and should not hesitate to say that since their constituents contributed a majority of the revenue and a majority of the population they should have the right to exercise their freedom of speech to prevent the passage of legislation ruinous to their people.

When we speak of majorities, Mr. President, let us not be blinded by our own estimate of our status. Let us not overemphasize our personal convenience or our personal convictions; and, particularly, let us not be guided by personal estimates of our colleagues. We may each in our private conscience find faults and shortcomings in the ability, as well as the reasoning, of some of our colleagues here. Mr. President, it is a great temptation to yearn for the power to shut off an irritating voice, particularly when that voice is being used against you.

## MAJORITY IS SOMETIMES WRONG

But the fact that a voice of the minority is irritating or repetitious or even sometimes presumptuous does not indict that voice as being wrong and in error. The majority is oftentimes irritating, repetitious and presumptuous, and the majority is sometimes wrong.

If either the majority or minority assumes that all arguments have been heard, all evidence presented, all original thoughts revealed, then that group is making an assumption which our human fallibility does not permit. Mr. President, it takes great wisdom for a man to know when he himself has said enough, and I pray for that good sense myself. But, I say to you, Mr. President, only wisdom akin to divine judgment can tell us when our fellow man has said all he should say.

The late Senator Joseph Robinson, of Arkansas, once said in this Chamber:

I am willing to vindicate this forum of open debate where fools may be arrogant, but where men who have studied problems still have a chance to speak.

Some may, most certainly, be arrogant here. Others may shame the name of the Senate. Willful men may be abusive. But when, in irritation, you withdraw freedom from the few who abuse it, you withdraw it from the wise and learned men, too.

If you subtract from the freedom of one region and of those who represent that region, you subtract from the freedom of all regions and all representatives. Freedom, gentlemen, does not oblige the formulas of mathematics. You cannot subtract a quantity here and add it elsewhere. True, it may be divided, but only in equals, not in fractions. There can be no two-thirds freedom or three-fourths freedom or ninety-nine point nine percent freedom; and no majority is so powerful, so righteous, so benevolent that it can change this simple reality.

#### MAJORITIES ARE NOT PERMANENT

Majority is, after all, Mr. President, a treacherous word. Majorities are not fixed, they are not permanent. The majority which today seems secure may vanish tomorrow.

I think it is quite pertinent to this discussion to examine the creation of majorities, how they are built and who builds them in American life today. Majorities, after all, do not simply materialize of their own accord without leadership and encouragement.

Majorities are the creation of communications. People form their judgments and mold their thinking by what they read, by what they see, by what they hear—and, perhaps, sometimes, or oftentimes, by what they smell. In this country, as in no other country in world history, our people have the opportunity to read more, see more, and hear more about public issues.

As our system of communications is improved and advanced by the discoveries of science, information is imparted with greater speeds. The report of what is going on—or, to be more exact, what seems to be going on—rushes direct from the point of origin to all Americans simultaneously. By radio, telegraph, telephone, and television, the information—or what one or two men in a particular agency may consider information—speeds out over the Nation and is received by individuals without a great deal of editing or much intentional commentary.

#### CITIZENS ARE BELIEVING SAME THING

The result of this is sobering, because, more and more, all our citizens are hearing the same thing, seeing the same thing, reading the same thing, and believing the same thing.

Furthermore, the trend of all agencies controlling the channels of rapid communication—a trend apparently demanded by the public—is for brevity. Our wire-service correspondents, our radio newsmen, all others collecting and presenting accounts of what happens here in the Senate Chamber or elsewhere, are told, "Make it brief, make it simple, but make it fast."

In such an atmosphere of speed and brevity, the word "filibuster" becomes a much more useful and meaningful expression than something such as unlimited debate or complete freedom of speech. A majority which would vigorously and devoutly defend a Senator's complete freedom of speech will, on the other hand, angrily condemn a Senator's filibuster because the word has been presented to them as an evil term, scornfully used.

That is only an illustration of a minor point, but I think it helps to emphasize the impact of rapid communications in building majority opinion.

#### MAJORITIES ARE ACCIDENTS OF TIMING

As the information reaching the public becomes more and more standardized, the first group to advocate and sponsor an idea here in Washington wins a tremendous advantage over their opposition. By presenting their case forcefully and persuasively and by presenting it rapidly, they have a good chance to captivate the majority of the people before any opposing group has time to marshal its forces and its evidence.

In other words, Mr. President, a majority can be and frequently is an accident of timing rather than the product of persuasion. As our communications become more rapid, almost instantaneous, we are going to see more majorities built up in a matter of days and even hours than in a period of months or years. We are going to see majorities demanding changes on less evidence and with less thought.

In the face of this obvious trend, it seems almost criminal to me for us to spend our time whittling away at the few remaining safeguards against unchecked and uncontrolled majority rule. These majorities, before which we are asked to bend our knee in submission, may not always be what they seem. Mass-produced majorities are quite likely to encourage mass-produced laws.

Somewhere in our legislative system, Mr. President, there must be preserved a forum where representatives of a minority, equipped with little more than their convictions and their voices, can stand in dignity and plead their case, unhurried and unhampered. If the pending resolution is adopted, no such forum will exist.

Oh, I know that proponents of this cloture resolution say every Senator would have ample time to present his

case. I know others will point out that what a minority says here will be given equal treatment by the agencies of communication, and the public will have ample opportunity to weigh the merits of the minority's case.

That may be true, as a theory. But while we have made tremendous progress in devising methods and mechanics for getting more and more opinions and information into the minds of the public, we have not made much progress in finding devices to get opinions out of the mind of the public. Mr. President, you may convince a man that something is true with merely a word or a sentence, but if you seek to convince him that he should change his mind, then a lifetime may not be long enough to achieve that goal.

We must not, we cannot, submit to the theory that a majority is a divine and sacred thing. We must not, we cannot, ignore the forces which construct majorities. Truth must retain the privilege of open competition with information, for truth and information are not always one and the same thing.

#### 1948 CAMPAIGN PROVES FALLACY

I would call to mind the happenings of last fall, which impressed me profoundly with the weight and power of unlimited debate. I say this to my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I say it with sincere respect. The information was abroad in the land that the Democratic Party was doomed to defeat; for most of the year, perhaps even as late as October, I am sure a majority in this country, accepted that information as correct. But there was no cloture rule on the man in the White House. There was no rule limiting him to an hour's debate because two-thirds of the Nation thought they had heard from him all they could hear, or all they wanted to hear.

Mr. Truman went out to the people. He talked to them, telling them his views again and again, repeating his arguments as often as men and women would come to listen. I rode with him on that train for awhile. I saw him up before daybreak, waiting to speak to the people who gathered around the rear platform as early as 6 o'clock in the morning. I saw him still speaking far into that night. Over and over again, I heard some of his close associates say, "If only we had a few more weeks, there would be no doubt about the outcome." They knew then that because Mr. Truman had dared to keep speaking, because Mr. Truman had not bowed before the opinion of the majority 5 months before, the people were listening and were changing their minds.

If anything in our history exposes the fallacy of assumptions ventured here regarding the infallibility of temporary majorities, the Presidential campaign and election of 1948 does just that. It will not be remembered to the credit of our name if a Democratic leadership deprives the Senate and the Nation of that right now.

Mr. President, during the course of our consideration of this measure, I have been greatly impressed by an observation which the senior Senator from Ala-

bama [Mr. HILL], made during the committee hearings. Speaking of his service in the House prior to his election to the Senate, the able Senator recalled that he often heard the appeal as a Representative:

We must go along with the party, because party government is the way of the House of Representatives.

And the Senator from Alabama added:

I am pleading here today that we not retreat to this position of party government, but let the Senate of the United States stand where it has always stood as the great forum of the American people, of the American Nation, and of the constitutional American Republic.

That is a point upon which I urge the Senators to think seriously. It will be, I believe, a sad day when the rules of the Senate can be written in the national conventions of any political party. I realize, of course, that the Democratic convention of last summer did not suggest that the rules of the Senate be changed. But, Mr. President, both parties adopted plans and presented promises which some leaders thought would necessitate limitations on debate here—if those planks and those promises were to be fulfilled. If we submit now to this effort to change the rules, we will be submitting to the dangerously unsound proposition that a political party shall be entitled not merely to representation by its members here, but to the greater and overwhelming power of dictating how the business of the Senate shall be conducted.

On Saturday, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out very effectively that it is characteristic of strong Executives to become impatient with any obstruction which thwarts their exercise of power. Political parties suffer some of the same characteristics. If, though, we change the rules here to oblige the Executive and oblige victorious parties, we may make those executives and those parties stronger, but we most certainly shall not be making our Government stronger. We shall, instead, be taking away from the strength of the Government. We shall be opening the way to rule by political leaders and closing the door on government by responsible and duly elected officials.

That brings us to another consideration I should like to review, without thought of personalities, present or past.

I sincerely believe that the right of unlimited debate in the Senate is an essential safeguard against potential total supremacy of the executive branch.

A man elevated to the office of the Presidency has virtually unlimited powers of influence over his countrymen. His own personality is a force of great impact upon all the people of the Nation and, in fact, upon the people of the world. Add to those powers directly his all those less-conspicuous powers of his aides, his administrative agencies, and the multitude of channels which feel his influence, and you have a force no other representative government has ever entrusted for long to one man.

If on occasion you grant to this titular head of government the further intoxicant of an overwhelming majority of loyal supporters in the legislative branch, then, Mr. President, you have a force well-nigh irresistible. The distinctions between executive and legislative are difficult to preserve under such circumstances; mere memoranda become laws, and laws become mere memoranda.

In such a situation, which, happily, is more hypothetical than historical, the entire theory of our governmental system of checks and balances dissolves and evaporates. There is no one to check and no one to balance, unless and except the remaining minority has the prospect of holding each decision up to lengthy and thorough inspection here on the Senate floor.

#### FEW GOOD BILLS WRITTEN HASTILY

Delay may be bad in the legislative process, although I do not think delay is bad per se. It has been my observation that few good bills have been written hastily, and few bad measures have been written slowly.

Checks and balances, as I interpret the theory, imply that the authors of our form of government were not so worried about good legislation being delayed as they were about bad legislation being delayed not at all. I believe it was their thought that the minority, no matter how small numerically, might always have something to say that the momentary majority should hear. The right to check and balance was not granted to the majority, because a majority rarely seeks control over itself. Those rights were conceived and installed in the Constitution solely as safeguards for minorities.

Examine the branches of our Government, examine the struggles and conflicts of philosophy, and this is evident: The distinction between our form of government and totalitarian government is the distinction between the executive and legislative branches.

To whatever extent that distinction disappears, falls into disrepute or disuse, or is destroyed, to that extent this Government loses its representative character and becomes totalitarian in practice.

If that distinction be removed, the authority of the courts, of course, becomes fictional.

Fortunately, through most of our history, the voters of the various sections of the Nation have held sufficiently different opinions as to send here legislative representatives of divergent views, men and women with principles and purposes that were not all culled from the same political primer. This has preserved for us the character and purpose of Congress as a forum where representatives of many shadings of thought and ambition could assemble, where they could blend laws suited to the wants and needs of more than 150,000,000 people. There has always been ample representation for minorities, whatever their identity or distinction.

But, as I stated earlier, the last two decades have brought us the advent of instantaneous communications, and

with that a standardization of reported information, information which is frequently all too brief and consequently misleading. Yet its influence on the opinion and viewpoint of the American people is profound.

Political beliefs are not immune; rather, they are particularly vulnerable, much more likely to succumb to the constant hammering of standardization than our religious, ethical, or moral beliefs. Many commentators already insist that the distinction in professed beliefs of our major political parties is disintegrating and remains only as a matter of emphasis.

This may be good. I do not propose to pass final judgment here, but this I believe: There is rarely one and only one proper answer to any problem, particularly the sort of delicate, complex problems presented to the legislative branch of this Government.

#### CONFLICT AND COMPROMISE

Lasting answers evolve from conflict and compromise. A gag rule is the trade-mark of temporary solutions arrived at by lazy minds. Yet the whole trend of our modern day thinking, as exemplified in this cloture resolution, is toward a gag rule and glorification of an unchallenged majority.

We—and I am speaking of all the Nation—read the same news, hear the same opinions on the radio, see the same personalities on the screen, and arrive, at approximately the same time, at the same conclusions. We think we have been thinking and congratulate ourselves on having thought alike, when actually we have not thought at all.

To me, all this is disturbing.

I am distressed by the regimentation, conscious or not, of our opinions, so that if we once make the wrong assumption and proceed on that judgment, we will plunge headlong to disaster with no one to warn us. But, Mr. President, I am more than distressed, I am genuinely alarmed, when this emphasis on standardization, and regimentation, if you please, paralyzes the judgment of a legislative body which was created to give sanctuary to disagreements.

If we fall prey to this trend here in the Senate, then the legislative branch of Government will surrender its most effective guarantee of a check on itself and a balance against the executive branch. For unlimited debate is a check on rash action within the legislative channels and a balance against abuses in the executive branch. Furthermore, we will be surrendering this guarantee at a time in our history when all evidence indicates a greater need to preserve and encourage the right to criticize and challenge mass opinion.

#### ROLE OF THE HOUSE

Like many of the Members of the Senate, I served for a number of years in the House of Representatives, at the other end of the Capitol, before coming to the Senate. I think I understand what that body can do and what it cannot do as a part of the legislative branch. It can and does feed a great quantity of new ideas into the bloodstream of legislative

thinking, because of its large and diverse membership. The House, also, is a great legislative laboratory for perfecting legislation, correcting oversights, and preventing impositions harmful to specific areas or groups.

But—and this I say with no intention to minimize the House's role—the House does not and cannot exert the force upon the Nation's political thinking that the Senate has and still does. Nor, in fact, does the House exert the equivalent influence upon the executive branch—its Members are not so secure in tenure, the frequent elections subject the Members to whims of public opinion, which, as we all know, can sometimes be aroused and inflamed by the leaders of the executive branch.

Why is the House in this role? Because there is no unlimited debate there. A member must oftentimes beg for a chance to address his fellow Members and then he is limited generally to 5 minutes or less. In that short time, he is fortunate if he can impress any of his colleagues, much less impress the Nation. As a consequence, the floor of the House and the cloakrooms constitute a national legislative workshop.

#### SENATE IS A NATIONAL FORUM

That leaves to the Senate the role of a national forum, where the underlying philosophy of legislation—as well as the surface details—can be laid bare for the public to contemplate. That in itself is a persuasive argument to me for lengthy and thorough debates on fundamental issues.

When a Senator speaks at length, it seems to me he is speaking, not alone to his colleagues, but to the Nation. Certainly history shows that the Nation frequently listens. To cut off any Senator from further debate is to cut off the Nation from further opportunity to become acquainted with the proposals affecting our people. Personally, I believe it is better for the Nation to hear too much about a bill before it becomes law than to know too little about it after that bill becomes a law.

So, Mr. President, it is my conviction that the right of unlimited debate here in the Senate is an essential safeguard in our American system of representative government; first, as a safeguard for the public's right to full information on all legislative decisions; second, as a safeguard against the deliberate or accidental destruction of the distinctions between the legislative and other branches of government; third, as a safeguard for Members here—both majority and minority—against rash, impetuous action, or action predicated on incomplete or inaccurate information.

It is well, perhaps, to add to this discussion an examination of the filibuster in actual practice. I do not wish to burden the ears of the Senators here or the pages of the RECORD with a repetition of history already presented so ably by various of my colleagues. But I do not honestly believe we can come to the heart of the debate unless and until some of the mythology of filibusters is exposed as more fiction than fact.

What, for example, does the average American citizen interested in affairs of

his Government believe about the filibuster?

#### FILIBUSTER NOT SOUTH'S PROPERTY

First, I believe it is a widespread conviction that the filibuster is now and has always been exclusively the property of Southern Senators. For the past few years this has been so as to certain pieces of legislation which, by their nature, concerned the South primarily. This is not necessarily a traditional alignment.

When the cloture resolution under which we now operate here in the Senate was adopted back in 1917, the southern Members of the Senate at that time voted for it, as did virtually all Senators on both sides of the aisle. One year later, the Underwood resolution, to limit debate during wartime to 1½ hours for each Senator, was brought before the Senate. That was even more drastic than the cloture proposed now. I was impressed, though, when I looked over a tabulation of the voting on that resolution. Voting for the resolution, and thus voting against filibusters, or even very extensive debate, were a majority of the Senators from Southern States. The bulk of the opposition to the measure came from 29 Republican Party members.

Through the years there have been similar votes in which some Southern Senators have been as vigorously opposed to the filibuster as Senators from other regions are today. I do not believe it can be shown that the South created the filibuster, or that only the South has defied the rest of the Nation in preserving it.

#### FILIBUSTERS NOT COMMONPLACE

Another concept prevailing in the public mind is the idea that the Senate does nothing but waste valuable time while a minority of its Members engage in filibusters. Cartoonists, literary artists, and sponsors of a lot of ill-considered ideas have labored long and with some success to implant this concept in the public mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield for a question only.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator adverted a little while ago to the fact that some of these so-called filibusters—I repeat, so-called—were carried on by Senators from the South. Is it not true that the reason that has happened is that the legislation the southern Senators were opposing was aimed at the Senators from the South, and was presented from a geographical and a political standpoint?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator speaks quite correctly, and I shall discuss some of that legislation in detail a little later in my remarks. I thank the senior Senator from Texas.

Frankly, until the resolution came under consideration here, I did not know what the truth was. I rather thought that filibusters were more or less commonplace affairs here in the Senate. But since this matter came before us, I have studied the history of filibusters and I have been surprised at what the true history of the filibuster is. From 1841 through 1948, only about 35 important filibusters have been conducted on the

Senate floor. When we consider the tremendous volume of legislation passing through here without filibuster, that number seems surprisingly small.

#### ONLY FIVE BILLS DEFEATED

What have these filibusters accomplished? As Senators have heard, and as many of them know, some 26 different bills have been temporarily defeated. I say temporarily because all except five of the measures filibustered have since become law—some within a few days, some within a few weeks, and a few such measures were delayed for a number of years. But just to reemphasize the record, I want to list the bills which, so far, have failed to become law because of filibusters:

First. The Force bill of 1890.

Second. The armed ship bill of 1917, which was actually not necessary since our merchant ships were armed under another existing statute.

Third. The antilynching bills.

Fourth. The anti-poll-tax bills.

Fifth. The FEPC bill.

That, Mr. President, is the list, the casualty list of filibusters.

Some of the proponents of the resolution contend that the fatality list should include some bills which were never brought to the floor for fear of a filibuster. That is easily said. But it might be more accurate to say only that a number of bills were never brought to the floor because their sponsors knew they would fail if brought to a vote. If you are going to indict the filibuster as a killer, indict it, please, only for the deaths of bills actually killed by filibusters, not for the deaths of weak-spined legislation which died of fright at the prospect of unlimited debate.

The fact remains, nevertheless, that filibusters have not occupied the majority nor even a significant portion of the Senate's time during the past 108 years. Filibusters have not killed off a great amount of legislation; instead, the overwhelming majority of bills filibustered have eventually become law. Only five bills can truthfully be listed as victims of the filibuster.

The Force bill of 1890 is a dead issue; history seems to agree that it was an unfortunate measure which should not have been passed anyway.

The armed ship bill became a dead issue almost immediately after its defeat, because it was not necessary.

I think I am safe in saying that no proponents of our present cloture resolution are in the least concerned over what happened to those two particular pieces of legislation. The defeat of those bills did not instigate this resolution. The defeat of those bills did not inflame the public hue and cry against unlimited debate in the Senate.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

No, Mr. President; when we strip away the trappings of rhetoric and theory and legend which surround the arguments here against the filibuster, we have left the simple fact that we are debating the so-called civil-rights legislation.

Some men, and some groups, have grown tired of exposing their measures for abolition of the poll tax, for punishment of lynch mobs, and for establish-

ment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission to full debate in the Senate of the United States. In their estimate of freedom, the freedom to speak here in the Senate is expendable and they are willing to demand its sacrifice for the theoretical gain of having these civil-rights measures enacted into law promptly. So, in great haste, and with a certain amount of strange illogic the strategy calls for depriving one minority of its rights in order to extend rights to other minorities.

As I said earlier here, Mr. President, freedom is not something which can be subtracted in one place and added somewhere else.

This civil-rights question brings into play all those strong and evil forces of racial prejudice. Perhaps no prejudice is so contagious or so dangerous as the unreasoning prejudice against men because of their birth, the color of their skin, or their ancestral background. Racial prejudice is dangerous because it is a disease of the majority, endangering minority groups. I say frankly that the Negro—as the minority group involved in this discussion of civil rights—has more to lose by the adoption of any resolution outlawing free debate in the Senate than he stands to gain by the enactment of the civil-rights bills as they are now written. Certainly these laws might give the Negro some opportunity to see those punished who interfered with his rights, but I do not believe any of these bills would actually guarantee the Negro—or any other group—that his rights would not be molested. If, perchance, the prejudice against the Negro of which we in the South are accused should spread across the Nation, fanned by inflammatory incident of only passing consequence, the Negro would have no recourse to halt enactment of vicious legislation here or elsewhere if this right of unlimited debate did not exist in the Senate.

I am not being fanciful in that illustration. The Ku Klux Klan, the Black Legion, and other such bigoted and vicious organizations have never been confined solely to the South; nor has prejudice itself thrived only in the South.

When we of the South rise here to speak against this resolution or to speak against the civil-rights proposals, we are not speaking against the Negro race. We are not attempting to keep alive the old flames of hate and bigotry. We are, instead, trying to prevent those flames from being rekindled. We are trying to tell the rest of the Nation that this is not the way to accomplish what so many want to do for the Negro. We are trying to tell the Senate that with all the sincerity we can command, but it seems that ears and minds were long ago closed.

I say this because I want my position on the civil-rights legislation understood clearly.

#### DO NOT BELIEVE IN POLL TAX

For example, I do not believe in the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. In all of my campaigns for public office—six times for the House and twice for the Senate—I have made my position perfectly clear, and those who voted for me understood that. I told them, as I tell Senators now, that I see no reason for the poll-tax provision in the statutes of my State. I have advocated and do ad-

vocate the repeal of the constitutional provision of Texas which makes the payment of a poll tax necessary before a citizen can vote. I point out, too, that the present Governor of Texas has recommended to the legislature the repeal of the poll-tax provision in the statutes. A resolution has been introduced in the Texas Legislature and reported favorably by a committee of the Texas Senate, traditionally the most conservative branch of the Texas Legislature, which would submit to the voters of Texas an amendment to the Constitution eliminating the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting.

That is as it should be. The framers of the Constitution of the United States were plain, specific, and unambiguous in providing that each State should have the right to prescribe the qualifications of its electorate and that the qualifications of electors voting for Members of Congress should be the same as the qualifications of electors voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. For that reason, and that reason alone, I believe that the proposed anti-poll-tax measures introduced in previous sessions of this body and advocated in the President's civil-rights program is wholly unconstitutional and violates the rights of the States guaranteed by section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

Believing that, I think I have the right to use my freedom to speak and stand on the floor of the Senate as long as I have the will, the determination, and the breath to oppose such a measure. I believe that I, and any other 32 Members of the Senate have as much right and the equal duty to prevent the passage of an unconstitutional law as do 9 members or 5 members of the Supreme Court to strike it down after it has been passed. I am not willing to surrender that right or that duty because the President of the United States thinks otherwise, or because of the hue and cry set up by those who claim to protect the rights of a minority while at the same time saying the majority should always rule supreme.

#### THE SOUTHERN POSITION

Mr. President, some Senators will find fault with that position; they may say that it answers nothing. But let me point this out to them: I, and a number of my colleagues from the southern poll-tax States, would like to have the poll tax repealed. We think that it may be done, eventually, if not this month or next month. But we know—because we know the South and because we know the people we represent—that if one of the anti-poll-tax bills is enacted, we may never see the States accept repeal of such a law. If we had a bill here and the power here to remove the laws properly and constitutionally, I, for one, would vote for repeal of the poll tax. But I do not believe that we have either the bill or the power. We would merely enact a law which, in due time, would be stricken down by the Supreme Court. Then we would have nothing. The States would be hamstrung by a hasty, ill-considered, and entirely futile act. The poll tax would remain; the right of unlimited debate would be dead, and the prospect of eliminating the poll tax

would be dead. Remember that many of us agree with other Senators in opposing the poll tax. Our counsel is not insincere, nor is it founded on prejudice. We, like they, are representatives of proud people; we know what our people will accept and what they will not accept, and we urge them earnestly to heed our advice.

#### TEXANS DETEST LYNCHING

I, like all other citizens, detest the shameful crime of lynching just as I detest the crime of murder in every form.

In Texas, lynchings are virtually nonexistent and not thought of as a recourse of individuals seeking justice, or what they consider justice. Most Texans would be incensed at the suggestion that a lynching would be proper, no matter how vicious the crime of which a man might be suspected. I cannot speak for all the Southern States because I am not as familiar with the residents of those States. But, Mr. President, within the past 20 years new generations of Texans have reached maturity free of the ingrained hatreds and prejudices which beset their forebears who had seen more violent eras. What these Texans—young Texans, primarily—know about lynching they have learned from the same source as Americans in regions outside the South have learned. They have learned about lynching through the modern-day literature, in which so many barren authors have sought to enrich their plots with dramatic accounts of lynch law. Every lynching is a tragedy; but lynching is not, modern fiction notwithstanding, the great and fundamental tragedy of American Democracy.

I say this not in an effort to summon a self-righteous argument to the defense of the South, but because I want to remind Senators of the changing character of the South. We have our faults, historical and otherwise. But if Congress is to legislate—or try to legislate—a new character for us, I think it should be mindful of conditions as they are, not as they have been pictured.

Again, I say, with respect to lynching as with respect to the poll tax, most of us agree with the motives of our colleagues, but we are trying to tell them that the method proposed in the civil-rights legislation will not accomplish what they intend.

The proposed antilynching bill—or those proposed in the past—would not merely punish the crime of murder, which should be punished, but would hold responsible those who are entirely innocent. It would indict as killers men and women who never held a gun in their hands; it would punish as accomplices men and women who would never associate with the irresponsible elements which perpetrate most lynchings.

I hold that if an officer fails or refuses to protect me against a mob bent upon invading my property, depriving me of my liberty to go where I please or do me physical violence, I am entitled to as much protection as a prisoner accused of crime who is likewise treated to mob violence. But these antilynching bills only propose punishment in the case of a prisoner under lawful arrest. Mr.

President, an enlightened public already has rendered such a law virtually unnecessary even if it were not unwise in its scope.

One of the other civil-rights measures deserves some passing attention. That is the bill for creation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission.

This, to me, is the least meritorious proposal in the whole civil-rights program. To my way of thinking, it is this simple: If the Federal Government can by law tell me whom I shall employ, it can likewise tell my prospective employees for whom they must work. If the law can compel me to employ a Negro, it can compel that Negro to work for me. It might even tell him how long and how hard he would have to work. As I see it, such a law would do nothing more than enslave a minority.

Such a law would necessitate a system of Federal police officers such as we have never before seen. It would require the policing of every business institution, every transaction made between an employer and employee, and, virtually, every hour of an employer's and employee's association while at work.

I do not think the proposed law is workable, Mr. President. I am convinced it would do everything but what its sponsors intend. I feel certain it would reverse our entire historical trend of progress. It would do nothing more than resurrect ghosts of another day to haunt us again. It would incite and inflame the passions and prejudices of a people to the extent that the chasm of our differences would be irreparably widened and deepened.

I can only hope sincerely that the Senate will never be called upon to entertain seriously any such proposal again.

Those are my feelings, Mr. President. I pray that they will not seem either unreasonable or narrowly prejudiced.

For those who would keep any group in our Nation in bondage, I have no sympathy or tolerance. Some may feel moved to deny this group or that the homes, the education, the employment which every American has a right to expect, but I am not one of those. My faith in my fellow man is too great to permit me to waste away my lifetime burning with hatred against any group. I believe, and I believe sincerely, that we have a system of representative government which is strong enough, flexible enough, and fair enough to permit all groups to work together toward a better life.

I believe, Mr. President, that we can find the fair and permanent answers to our problems of housing, education, medical care, income—and all the other domestic issues—without reducing government to an absurdity by attempting to police the most intimate thoughts of our populace. I do not concede to Federal law an obligation which I think rightfully belongs to education, and which education alone can discharge. These advances must come and will only come as an outgrowth of conviction, not by compulsion.

Mr. President, we in the Senate should learn the facts of life. We cannot legislate love. We can, and as a nation we do, work together. We have done that

in the past. We are doing it today. It is my conviction, though, that the opportunity for unlimited debate—somewhere within the framework of our Government—will be a greater aid to unity and cooperation and justice than any of the laws presented to us in the civil-rights program.

I realize, Mr. President, that it is easy for a young man to say, "We're going to roll up our sleeves and remake the world." I know the temptation is great for young men to assume that speed and progress are one and the same thing; that if you move rapidly, you move forward.

No nation, though, can long survive if its lawmakers legislate only from day to day. Somewhere within the fabric of our actions we must weave the sturdy fibers of our past, lest what we do in haste today unravel tomorrow. Read the history of our Nation, the history of American democracy, and I think it seems clearly evident that few things have contributed more to our solidarity, to our emerging maturity, or to our stature as citizens of the world than the debates conducted here in the Senate Chamber. Debate here has been, perhaps, the sturdiest fiber of our design for more representative government.

That is as it should be, Mr. President, and as it must be. As nations go we are young, both in terms of physical existence and in concepts of what we want to do. From the start we have had to proceed without signposts to guide us. Our concept of government has been an experiment, and it remains so today. We have nothing but our own reason to guide us; there are no precedents, no past examples to steer us easily through the shoals of international leadership where we find ourselves today.

Our predecessors here—the great names of American political history—were keenly aware of the responsibilities resting upon their decisions. They made no effort to dismiss their duties in great haste. They weighed a man's convictions, not by the clock, but, rather, by what he had to say.

Read through the transcripts of the Senate's proceedings when giants like Webster, Calhoun, and Clay stood here. No official record was kept of the length of time they spoke, as measured in hours and minutes; but we find, if we look, that a speech by Webster, back in 1830, filled 30 pages of the Journal; John C. Calhoun's last speech on slavery in 1850 was 22 pages long; Henry Clay, speaking on the compromise of 1850, expressed his firm convictions for 26 pages. Perhaps styles of oratory have changed since those men were here. Perhaps none of us have that much to say. But, Mr. President, styles do not change in freedoms; and the inability or unwillingness of men to utilize their freedom does not justify taking of it from them.

The freedoms we enjoy today are not freedoms of our own making. Through all the long history of civilizations preceding ours, mankind's highest aspiration has been for greater freedom. It was not until this union of States was formed a little more than a century and a half ago that freedom found a sanctuary. I do not propose to tear down that sanctuary now, in the name of haste, because

I believe the freedom to speak—the freedom of unlimited debate somewhere in our law-making process—is the keystone of all other freedoms.

Look back at the governments of history. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] a few days ago very appropriately referred to debates in the Roman forum. Rome enjoyed its greatest progress, its greatest era of achievement during the days when great orators could stand in the forum and speak with freedom. When, in irritation, the Caesars and their partisans removed that freedom, Rome began fading as an influence in the world; and the way was paved for a long succession of arbitrary monarchs and dictators. The right of unlimited debate in the Senate of France was lost in 1814, a victim of cloture—and there followed a century, and longer, of internal confusion and strife. In England, the House of Commons gave up its right to unlimited debate in 1888. That nation has produced some great prime ministers since—men who had the privilege, as well as the talent, to speak thoroughly and forcefully, but it would be difficult for any Member of the Senate to name any lengthy list of members of Parliament who have inspired their countrymen with arguments advanced on the floor of the House of Commons since 1888.

I am no historian, but as I have studied the history of governments gone before us, I have been impressed by the fact that the freedom of unlimited debate in legislative chambers has been given up many times by members themselves who were irritated or frustrated by a minority. But, so far as I have found, once that freedom was yielded, it has never been returned. If we now give up this freedom in the Senate, I, for one, do not expect to live to see its return. For that reason, I cannot and I will not join hands with those who seek to throw this freedom out the window now.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said the other day, this effort to cut off unlimited debate is a whittling process, whittling at the essential freedoms of our mind. I should like to point out here to the writers with their wrathful pens, to the commentators with their caustic voices, to the cartoonists with their derisive skills, and all who join the throng to keep alive the cries against unlimited debate that we here in the Senate of the United States cherish our freedom of expression as they cherish theirs. But for the grace of God and the United States Senate we might today be debating the limitation of their freedom to speak or that of the press, rather than our own.

If, Mr. President, I were given a choice, if I should have the opportunity to send into the countries behind the iron curtain one freedom and only one, I know what my choice would be. I would send to those lands the very freedom we are attempting to disown here in the Senate. I would send to those nations the right of unlimited debate in their legislative chambers. It would go as merely a seed, but the harvest would be bountiful; for by planting in their system this bit of freedom we would see all freedoms grow, as they have never grown before on the soils of eastern Europe.

This freedom we debate, Mr. President, is fundamental and indispensable. It stands as the fountainhead of all our freedoms. If we now, in haste and irritation, shut off this freedom, we shall be cutting off the most vital safeguard which minorities possess against the tyranny of momentary majorities. I do not want my name listed as one of those who took this freedom away from the world when the world most needed it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Connor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Chapman	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Lodge	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Downey	Lucas	Taft
Eastland	McCarran	Taylor
Eaton	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	McGrath	Tobey
Frear	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Green	Martin	Wiley
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hayden	Miller	Withers
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young
Hickenlooper	Morse	
Hill		

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator yields for that purpose, he will yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator yield in order that I may make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to make sure that my right to the floor is protected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that every morning, immediately after the Senate has convened, opportunity has been afforded, under a unanimous-consent agreement, to present routine matters. I dislike very much to object, and I shall not at this particular time, but I hope that Senators will be present when the roll is called in the mornings,

so that we can proceed without interruption. I have made this suggestion to one or two other Senators, and I make it again to my friend from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and consent is given the Senator from Virginia, with the understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire does not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government during the month of January 1949, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, to have it printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

	January	Total civilian employees, executive branch	Civilian employees, Military Establishment	Civilian employees, civilian agencies	Civilian employees inside continental United States	Civilian employees outside continental United States
1948		2,102,854	892,184	1,210,670	1,911,342	191,512
1949		2,001,836	834,376	1,167,460	1,775,867	225,969
Increased or decreased		+101,318	+57,808	+43,210	+135,475	-34,457

The steady increase of Federal civilian employment inside continental United States is obvious from these figures. This results largely from reduction of its civilian force abroad by the Military Establishment and the increase in the number of its civilian employees at home. Within the year the Military Establishment decreased its civilian rolls overseas by 34,933, but it increased its civilian employees at home by 92,741. Civilian agencies increased their employment 42,734 inside the United States and 476 abroad.

#### PAY

In the first 6 months of the current fiscal year the Federal pay roll in the executive branch cost \$3,258,446,000. If this average of more than a half billion a month is continued through the second half of the year to June 30, the personal service cost for the year will be in excess of \$6,500,000,000.

During the first 6 months the pay roll cost increased successively in every month except October. It was \$516,578,000 in July, \$532,082,000 in August, \$535,280,000 in September, \$525,487,000 in October, \$535,303,000 in November, and \$613,716,000 in December.

#### JANUARY-DECEMBER

While there was a net decrease of 1,602 in the total civilian personnel employed in the executive branch in January as compared with December, there was an actual increase of 653 in the employment inside continental United States. This net increase inside the country occurred despite substantial seasonal decreases by the Post Office and Agriculture Departments, a major decrease in the Veterans' Administration resulting from field office reorganization, and the continuing liquidation of War Assets Administration. Larger increases were reported by the Treasury Department and the Military Establishment. The over-all employment in January totaled 2,102,854 in January as compared with 2,104,456 in December.

#### MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

With its civilian employment rising each month, the Military Establishment in January was employing 892,184 civilians. Uniformed military personnel in the same month numbered 1,665,000. Both figures were in excess of the average for next fiscal year which the President, in his budget message esti-

I ask also that the report be preceded by a statement of explanation and comment which I submit at the same time.

There being no objection, the explanatory statement and comment and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Federal civilian employment in January 1949 exceeded the number employed in January 1948 by more than 100,000, and pay-roll figures for the first half of the current fiscal year indicate civilian personal service costs in the executive branch this year will reach \$6,500,000,000.

#### PERSONNEL

Compared with the report for January 1948, the new report covering civilian personnel in the executive branch during January 1949, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, shows:

mated at 865,000 civilians, and 1,616,000 uniformed military personnel in active status.

#### CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OVERSEAS

This committee report includes a tabular break-down of civilian personnel employed outside continental United States as of December 1948. It shows nearly 200,000 employees representing 33 Federal agencies in 96 countries.

Agencies with the larger numbers of persons assigned overseas include the Army, Air Force, Navy, State, Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, and Post Office Departments, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Veterans' Administration.

Foreign countries to which the largest numbers of Federal employees are assigned include Austria, China, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Philippine Islands, Newfoundland, Mexico, Great Britain, and Canada.

#### ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY

#### FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH DECEMBER 1948-JANUARY 1949, AND PAY NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1948

(Note with reference to personal service expenditure figures: It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of December, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of November, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of January and are compared with employment figures for the month of December. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.)

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table

III shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

### Personnel and pay summary

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for January 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total.....	2,102,854	2,104,456	-1,602	613,716	535,303	+78,413
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,210,670	1,214,228	-3,558	380,102	316,094	+64,008
2. National Military Establishment.....	892,184	890,228	+1,956	233,614	219,209	+14,405
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense.....	1,226	1,190	+36	450	415	+35
Department of the Army.....	367,884	367,365	+519	94,118	84,443	+9,675
Department of the Air Force.....	158,789	157,799	+990	38,292	39,136	-844
Department of the Navy.....	364,285	363,874	+411	100,754	95,215	+5,539

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

#### Inside continental United States (See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States increased 653 from the December total of 1,910,689 to the January total of 1,911,342.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was a decrease of 4,265 from the December total of 1,159,955, to the January total of 1,155,690.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for January was 755,652, an increase of 4,918 over the December total of 750,734.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 36 from the December figure of 1,190 to the January figure of 1,226.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 2,792 from the December figure of 297,049 to the January figure of 299,841.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within continental United States increased 1,259 from the December figure of 130,946 to the January figure of 132,205.

The Department of the Navy within the United States increased 831 from the December figure of 321,549 to the January figure of 322,380.

#### Outside continental United States (See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel decreased 2,255 from the December total of 193,767 to the January total of 191,512.

An increase of 707 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the December total of 54,273 to the January total of 54,980.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 2,962 from the December figure of 139,494 to the January figure of 136,532.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 2,273 in overseas employment from the December figure of 70,316 to the January figure of 68,043.

The civilian personnel of the Department of the Air Force overseas decreased 269 from the December figure of 26,853 to the January figure of 26,584.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 420 in overseas employment from

the December figure of 42,325 to the January figure of 41,905.

#### Industrial employment (See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of January decreased 284 from the December total of 574,448 to the January total of 574,164.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased 431 from the December total of 19,327 to the January total of 19,758.

The National Military Establishment decreased its total industrial employment 715 from the December total of 555,121, to the January total of 554,406.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment 216 from the December figure of 206,605 to the January figure of 206,389. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 1,899, while overseas industrial employment decreased 2,115.

The Department of the Air Force industrial employment decreased 198 from the December figure of 95,248 to the January figure of 95,050. Inside continental United States the Air Force industrial employment increased 301; while outside continental United States it decreased 499.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 301 from the December figure of 253,268 to the January figure of 252,967.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

#### Employees outside continental United States as of December 1948

Table V is carried at the end of this additional report by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures as a special report. It will not be repeated as a regular table in the report. It was compiled at this time in response to a request by members of the committee and it should be noted that the figures in this table were reported orally by responsible officers in each of the reporting agencies instead of in signed reports ordinarily required by the committee for preparation of the other tables in its regular monthly reports.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948; and pay for December 1948 and comparison with November 1948

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	November	December	Increase	Decrease	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture.....	18,419	19,323	904	-----	74,963	73,680	-----	1,283
Commerce.....	12,195	12,614	419	-----	40,139	39,926	-----	213
Interior.....	13,496	13,959	503	-----	49,484	49,588	104	-----
Justice.....	9,178	9,539	361	-----	26,195	26,345	150	-----
Labor.....	1,131	1,211	80	-----	3,507	3,521	14	-----
Post Office.....	125,072	178,809	53,737	-----	508,321	507,507	-----	814
State.....	5,649	5,941	292	-----	20,001	20,115	114	-----
Treasury.....	26,578	28,075	1,497	-----	88,567	89,015	448	-----
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office.....	85	84	-----	1	214	218	4	-----
Bureau of the Budget.....	248	261	13	-----	538	530	-----	8
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	15	15	-----	-----	64	69	5	-----
National Security Council.....	9	9	-----	-----	19	22	3	-----
National Security Resources Board.....	170	190	20	-----	390	410	20	-----
Council of Economic Advisers.....	23	23	-----	-----	39	39	-----	-----
Emergency war agencies:								
Office of Defense Transportation.....	12	17	5	-----	40	39	-----	1
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission.....	32	40	8	-----	116	147	31	-----
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	800	876	76	-----	2,852	3,078	226	-----
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	1,585	1,661	76	-----	4,837	4,856	19	-----
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	32	84	52	-----	134	128	-----	6
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	217	203	-----	14	937	933	-----	4
War Assets Administration.....	4,155	4,007	-----	852	7,349	6,708	-----	641

1 Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948; and pay for December 1948 and comparison with November 1948—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	November	December	Increase	Decrease	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	14	15	1		135	138	3	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1,682	1,768	86		4,835	4,803		32
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	290	274	14		664	670	6	
Civil Service Commission.....	1,247	1,480	233		4,118	4,228	110	
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	60	61	1		123	122		1
Federal Communications Commission.....	503	535	32		1,554	1,553		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	371	389	18		1,031	1,052	21	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	198	221	23		377	374		3
Federal Power Commission.....	353	341		12	831	824		7
Federal Security Agency <sup>2</sup> .....	9,321	9,234		87	34,972	35,114	142	
Federal Trade Commission.....	244	295	51		634	650	16	
Federal Works Agency.....	5,751	5,978	227		22,853	23,081	228	
General Accounting Office.....	2,887	3,034	147		9,411	9,432	21	
Government Printing Office.....	2,099	2,231	132		6,953	6,999	46	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	3,636	3,806	170		11,678	11,862	184	
Indian Claims Commission.....	6	7	1		11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	872	913	41		2,286	2,248		38
Maritime Commission.....	2,099	1,878		221	6,530	6,571	41	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	1,816	2,236	420		6,887	6,895	8	
National Archives.....	105	135	30		380	388	8	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	7	81	74		306	308	2	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	9	13	4		20	18		2
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	2	1		1	3	3		
National Gallery of Art.....	80	82	2		317	320	3	
National Labor Relations Board.....	574	567		7	1,661	1,582		79
National Mediation Board.....	53	58	5		107	108	1	
Panama Canal.....	3,290	3,216		74	22,918	22,920	2	
Railroad Retirement Board.....	683	706	23		2,388	2,421	33	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	1,832	1,832			4,623	4,623		
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	467	486	19		1,159	1,165	6	
Selective Service System.....	1,075	1,212	137		5,979	5,903		76
Smithsonian Institution.....	166	175	9		555	549		6
Tariff Commission.....	103	108	5		239	240	1	
Tax Court of the United States.....	54	53		1	124	122		2
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	3,510	3,775	265		13,982	13,771		211
Veterans' Administration.....	51,501	54,948	3,447		215,078	212,928		2,150
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	316,094	380,102	64,426	418	1,214,228	1,210,670	2,020	5,578
Net change, excluding National Military Establishment.....			64,008				3,558	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	415	450	35		1,190	1,226	36	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States.....	71,312	78,463	7,151		297,049	299,841	2,792	
Outside continental United States.....	13,131	15,655	2,524		70,316	68,043		2,273
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States.....	33,800	32,661		1,139	130,946	132,205	1,259	
Outside continental United States.....	5,336	5,631	295		26,853	26,584		269
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States.....	95,215	100,754	5,539		363,874	364,285	411	
Total, National Military Establishment.....	219,209	233,614	15,544	1,139	890,228	892,184	4,498	2,542
Net increase, National Military Establishment.....			14,405				1,956	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	535,303	613,716	79,970	1,557	2,104,456	2,102,854	6,518	8,120
Net change, including National Military Establishment.....			78,413				1,602	

<sup>2</sup> Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institute for the Deaf.<sup>3</sup> January personnel figures and December pay-roll figures for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were not available in time for inclusion in this report.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture.....	78,101	71,622	-1,479
Commerce.....	37,138	36,922	-216
Interior.....	44,325	44,260	-65
Justice.....	25,725	25,868	+143
Labor.....	3,471	3,485	+14
Post Office.....	506,585	505,774	-811

Footnotes at end of table.

XCV—130

TABLE II.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)—continued			
State.....	7,608	7,744	+136
Treasury.....	87,919	88,359	+440
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office.....	214	218	+4
Bureau of the Budget.....	538	530	-8
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	64	69	+5

TABLE II.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—CON.			
National Security Council.....	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board.....	390	410	+20
Council of Economic Advisers.....	39	39	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation.....	40	39	-1

TABLE II.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Displaced Persons Commission	45	56	+11
Economic Cooperation Administration	854	901	+47
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,813	4,831	+18
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	-----
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	5	-2
War Assets Administration	7,326	6,693	-633
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7	-----
Atomic Energy Commission	4,832	4,900	-32
Civil Aeronautics Board	644	650	+6
Civil Service Commission	4,113	4,223	+110
Export-Import Bank of Washington	121	120	-1
Federal Communications Commission	1,318	1,318	-----
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,031	1,052	+21
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	377	374	-3
Federal Power Commission	831	824	-7
Federal Security Agency <sup>2</sup>	33,994	34,141	+147
Federal Trade Commission	634	650	+16
Federal Works Agency	22,394	22,448	+54
General Accounting Office	9,411	9,432	+21
Government Printing Office	6,953	6,999	+46
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,634	11,814	+180
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	-----
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,286	2,248	-38
Maritime Commission	6,492	6,532	+40
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,887	6,895	+8
National Archives	380	388	+8
National Capital Housing Authority	306	308	+2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	18	-2
National Capital Sesqui-centennial Commission	3	3	-----
National Gallery of Art	317	320	+3
National Labor Relations Board	1,648	1,570	-78
National Mediation Board	107	108	+1
Panama Canal	635	647	+12
Railroad Retirement Board	2,388	2,421	+33
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,610	4,610	-----
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	1,165	+6
Selective Service System	5,819	5,742	-77
Smithsonian Institution	550	543	-7
Tariff Commission	239	240	+1
Tax Court of the United States	124	122	-2
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,982	13,771	-211
Veterans' Administration	213,475	211,327	-2,148
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,159,955	1,155,600	{ -5,821 +1,556
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			-4,265
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,190	1,226	+36
Department of the Army	297,049	299,841	+2,792
Department of the Air Force	130,946	132,205	+1,259
Department of the Navy	321,549	322,380	+831
Total, National Military Establishment	750,734	755,652	{ +4,918 -----

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CON.</b>			
Net increase, National Military Establishment			+4,918
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,910,689	1,911,342	{ +6,474 -5,821
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+653
<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.			
<sup>2</sup> Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.			
<sup>3</sup> January personnel figures for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were not available in time for inclusion in this report.			
<b>TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1949, and comparison with December 1948</b>			
Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)</b>			
Agriculture	1,862	2,058	+196
Commerce	3,001	3,004	+3
Interior	5,159	5,328	+169
Justice	470	477	+7
Labor	36	36	-----
Post Office	1,736	1,733	-3
State	12,393	12,371	-22
Treasury	648	656	+8
<b>POSTWAR AGENCIES</b>			
Displaced Persons Commission	71	91	+20
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,998	2,177	+179
Office of the Housing Expediter	24	25	+1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	132	126	-6
Philippine War Damage Commission	930	928	-2
War Assets Administration	23	15	-8
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
American Battle Monuments Commission	128	131	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	20	-----
Civil Service Commission	5	5	-----
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	-----
Federal Communications Commission	36	35	-1
Federal Security Agency	978	973	-5
Federal Works Agency	459	633	+174
Housing and Home Finance Agency	44	48	+4
Maritime Commission	38	39	+1
National Labor Relations Board	13	12	-1
Panama Canal	22,283	22,273	-10
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13	13	-----
Selective Service System	160	161	+1
Smithsonian Institution	5	6	+1
Veterans' Administration	1,603	1,601	-2
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	54,273	54,980	{ +707 -60
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+707

TABLE III.—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Department of the Army	70,316	68,043	-2,273
Department of the Air Force	26,853	26,584	-269
Department of the Navy	42,325	41,905	-420
Total, National Military Establishment	139,494	136,532	{ -2,962 -----
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			-2,962
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	193,767	191,512	{ -3,022 +767
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			-2,255

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1949 and comparison with December 1948

Department or agency	December	January	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
<b>EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)</b>			
Commerce	1,237	1,098	-139
Interior	3,935	4,509	+574
State	359	355	-4
Treasury	4,305	4,352	+47
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>			
Atomic Energy Commission	157	150	-7
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	6	+4
Panama Canal	1,887	1,853	-34
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,445	7,437	-8
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	19,327	19,758	{ +425 -194
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+431
<b>NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT</b>			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	158,863	160,762	+1,899
Outside continental United States	47,742	45,627	-2,115
Department of the Air Force: Inside continental United States	75,463	75,764	+301
Outside continental United States	19,785	19,286	-499
Department of the Navy	253,268	252,967	-301
Total, National Military Establishment	555,121	554,406	{ -715 +2,200
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			-715
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	574,448	574,164	{ -284 +3,109 +2,825
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			-284

TABLE V.—Civilian personnel of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed outside continental United States as of December 1948

[NOTE.—These figures were compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in response to a request by members made during the meeting of the committee, Jan. 26, 1949. The figures included in this table were reported orally by responsible officers in each of the reporting agencies, instead of in signed written reports ordinarily required by the committee for the preparation of its regular monthly personnel reports]

Country	Agriculture Department	Commerce Department	Interior Department	Justice Department	Labor Department	Post Office Department	State Department	Treasury Department	Air Force Department	Army Department	Navy Department	American Battle Monuments Commission	Atomic Energy Commission	Civil Aeronautics Board	Civil Service Commission	Displaced Persons Commission	Economic Cooperation Administration
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
1. Aden.....							10										
2. Afghanistan.....							33										
3. Alaska.....	107	1,584	3,688	120	3	394		128	2,612	1,704	910			20			
4. Argentina.....		3					156				7						
5. Atlantic Islands <sup>1</sup> .....		2					84		1,233	3,333	2,064						
6. Australia.....		2					100				3						
7. Austria.....							179			8,731							29
8. Azores.....									1,058								
9. Balkans (unspecified).....							4										
10. Belgium.....							184	3				3					21
11. Bermuda.....									551								
12. Bolivia.....	3	2					75										
13. Brazil.....	3	4	3				371			116	80						
14. British Guiana.....									525								
15. Bulgaria.....							59				2						
16. Burma.....							86										
17. Canada.....				44			280	31	255		4		3				
18. Canal Zone.....	7	125		8			3		3,423	4,922	3,339						
19. Ceylon.....							38										
20. Chile.....		1					128				7						
21. China (including Hong-kong).....		4					1,045	3	40	963	1,605						468
22. Colombia.....	4	1					126				4						
23. Costa Rica.....	133						64										
24. Cuba.....	3			9			140	3			3,027						
25. Cyprus.....							8										
26. Czechoslovakia.....							177										
27. Denmark and possessions.....							109				5						19
28. Dominican Republic.....	3						48										
29. Ecuador.....	5						102										
30. Egypt.....	2	9					243	2	1		91						
31. El Salvador.....	3						67										
32. Eritrea.....										147							
33. Ethiopia.....							36										
34. European colonies (Gibraltar).....							7										
35. European colonies, protectorates, etc., in Near East and Africa.....							159										
36. Finland.....							68										
37. France and possessions (including French Morocco).....	2	4					741	5	111	3,633	559	116					633
38. Germany (and Bizonia).....				59			681	4	876	6,897							20
39. Great Britain (including North Ireland).....		6		1			611	12	12	3	121	4					79
40. Greece.....							271		29	167	5						490
41. Greenland.....		31							255								
42. Guatemala.....	39						120		44		7						
43. Haiti.....	38						78										
44. Hawaii.....	134	610	65	75	8	616		295	3,651	6,321	15,473				5		
45. Honduras.....							48										
46. Hungary.....							139										
47. Iceland.....		18					34										
48. India and Pakistan.....	2						431				9						1
49. Indochina.....							34										
50. Iran.....							133										
51. Iraq.....							79										
52. Ireland.....							73										
53. Israel.....							18										5
54. Italy (including Trieste and the Vatican).....							605	5	45	1,605	7	2					146
55. Jamaica.....									362								
56. Japan.....		3	5				115		5,819	7,003							
57. Korea.....							81		2	222							
58. Labrador.....									323								
59. Lebanon.....							65				4						
60. Liberia.....							106										
61. Libya.....							7		736								
62. Luxembourg.....							12										
63. Malaya.....							38										
64. Mediterranean area.....										1,045							
65. Mexico.....	644	7	9				501	2			8	3					
66. Morocco.....							82										
67. Netherlands and possessions (excluding East Indies).....	3						182	1			6						35
68. Netherlands East Indies.....							62				3						
69. Newfoundland.....							15		1,455		803						
70. New Zealand.....							43										
71. Nicaragua.....	3						64		3								
72. Norway.....							108				4						22
73. Nova Scotia.....				4													
74. Pacific Islands <sup>2</sup> .....	2	228				18	8		1,620	5,141	6,914						
75. Panama.....	1						86	2									
76. Palestine.....							63										
77. Paraguay.....							85										
78. Peru.....	13	7	1				161				5						
79. Philippine Islands.....		170	145				350	31	771	17,922	5,671						
80. Poland.....							182										

<sup>1</sup> Includes Antilles, British West Indies, and American West Indies except Virgin Islands.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Canton, Carolines, Guam, Marianas, Midway, Okinawa, Palmyra, Ryukyus, Samoa, Swan, Tinian, and Wake Islands, etc.

TABLE V.—Civilian personnel of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed outside continental United States as of December 1948—Continued

Country	Agriculture Department	Commerce Department	Interior Department	Justice Department	Labor Department	Post Office Department	State Department	Treasury Department	Air Force Department	Army Department	Navy Department	American Battle Monu- ments Com- mis- sion	Atomic Energy Com- mis- sion	Civil Aero- nautics Board	Civil Service Com- mis- sion	Dis- placed Per- sons Com- mis- sion	Econ- omic Co- opera- tion Admin- istra- tion
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
81. Portugal and possessions							118				6						2
82. Puerto Rico	632	112	550	42	25	653		113	1,041		1,506						
83. Rumania							89				7						
84. Russia							157				10						
85. Saudi Arabia							52										
86. Siam	2						76				7						
87. Spain and possessions							217				6						
88. Sweden							148	4			8						26
89. Switzerland							208	4									
90. Syria							55										
91. Turkey							185			66	9						2
92. Union of South Africa							89				4						
93. Uruguay							85				6						
94. Venezuela		2					99				4						
95. Virgin Islands		16	685	20		34											
96. Yugoslavia							112				4						
Location unspecified	1	* 11		* 88		* 21				* 374							
Without compensation, location unspecified	74	30	2				2			1							
Total	1,862	3,001	5,159	470	36	1,736	12,393	648	28,853	70,316	42,325	128	3	20	5	71	1,998

Country	Export-Import Bank	Federal Communications Commission	Federal Security Agency	Federal Works Agency	Housing and Home Finance Agency	Maritime Commission	National Labor Relations Board	Office of Housing Expediter	Panama Canal	Philippine Alien Property Administration	Philippine War Damage Commission	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	Selective Service System	Smithsonian Institution	Veterans' Administration	War Assets Administration	Total
	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	(33)	
1. Aden																	10
2. Afghanistan																	33
3. Alaska		8	21	128	3			7				4	11		71	13	11,536
4. Argentina																	165
5. Atlantic Islands <sup>1</sup>																	6,716
6. Australia																	105
7. Austria																	8,939
8. Azores																	1,058
9. Balkans (unspecified)																	4
10. Belgium																	211
11. Bermuda																	551
12. Bolivia				3													83
13. Brazil	2											1		2			582
14. British Guiana																	525
15. Bulgaria																	61
16. Burma																	86
17. Canada			14														631
18. Canal Zone			1						22,283								34,111
19. Ceylon																	38
20. Chile																	136
21. China (including Hong-kong)			1														4,129
22. Colombia																	135
23. Costa Rica				35								1					233
24. Cuba			2													1	3,185
25. Cyprus																	8
26. Czechoslovakia																	177
27. Denmark and possessions																	133
28. Dominican Republic																	51
29. Ecuador				1													108
30. Egypt																	348
31. El Salvador				2													72
32. Eritrea																	147
33. Ethiopia																	36
34. European colonies (Gibraltar)																	7
35. European colonies, protectorates, etc., in Near East and Africa																	159
36. Finland																	68
37. France and possessions (including French Morocco)			6			4											5,814
38. Germany (and Bizonia)			10			1											8,619
39. Great Britain (including North Ireland)			5			11											865
40. Greece																	962
41. Greenland																	285
42. Guatemala			4	12													228
43. Haiti																	117
44. Hawaii		17	66	7	14		3					1		28	199	6	27,602
45. Honduras				1													49
46. Hungary																	139
47. Iceland																	53
48. India and Pakistan																	442

<sup>1</sup> Includes Antilles, British West Indies, and American West Indies except Virgin Islands.<sup>2</sup> South American mission.<sup>3</sup> Location withheld for security reasons. Overseas personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency is excluded from this table for security reasons.<sup>4</sup> The latest actual reports available from the Post Office Department with respect to its personnel overseas was for the month of October. The figures in this chart represent a departmental estimate based on adjustments from the October report. Information on the location of 21 employees was insufficient for this adjustment.<sup>5</sup> South American mission (10) and Army Attachés, world wide (364).

TABLE V.—Civilian personnel of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed outside continental United States as of December 1948—Continued

Country	Export-Import Bank	Federal Communications Commission	Federal Security Agency	Federal Works Agency	Housing and Home Finance Agency	Maritime Commission	National Labor Relations Board	Office of Housing Expediter	Panama Canal	Philippine Alien Property Administration	Philippine War Damage Commission	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	Selective Service System	Smithsonian Institution	Veterans' Administration	War Assets Administration	Total
	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	(33)	
49. Indochina.....																	34
50. Iran.....																	133
51. Iraq.....																	79
52. Ireland.....																	78
53. Israel.....																	18
54. Italy (including Trieste and the Vatican).....			2			8											2,425
55. Jamaica.....																	362
56. Japan.....						4											12,949
57. Korea.....																	305
58. Labrador.....																	323
59. Lebanon.....																	69
60. Liberia.....			4														111
61. Libya.....																	743
62. Luxembourg.....																	12
63. Malaya.....																	38
64. Mediterranean area.....																	1,045
65. Mexico.....			1											2			1,177
66. Morocco.....																	82
67. Netherlands and possessions (excluding East Indies).....			1														228
68. Netherlands East Indies.....																	65
69. Newfoundland.....																	2,273
70. New Zealand.....					5												43
71. Nicaragua.....																	75
72. Norway.....			1														134
73. Nova Scotia.....																	5
74. Pacific Islands <sup>1</sup> .....					15												13,931
75. Panama.....																	104
76. Palestine.....																	63
77. Paraguay.....																	85
78. Peru.....			1														189
79. Philippine Islands.....			602	196		10				132	930			1	558		27,488
80. Poland.....																	182
81. Portugal and possessions.....																	125
82. Puerto Rico.....		10	226	21	25		10	17				3	116		775	3	5,886
83. Rumania.....																	96
84. Russia.....																	167
85. Saudi Arabia.....																	52
86. Siam.....												1					86
87. Spain and possessions.....																	223
88. Sweden.....																	186
89. Switzerland.....			1														213
90. Syria.....																	55
91. Turkey.....				28													290
92. Union of South Africa.....																	93
93. Uruguay.....																	91
94. Venezuela.....																	105
95. Virgin Islands.....			10	5	2								5				777
96. Yugoslavia.....																	116
Location unspecified.....																	494
Without compensation, location unspecified.....																	109
Total.....	2	36	978	469	44	38	13	24	22,283	132	930	13	160	5	1,603	23	193,767

<sup>1</sup> Includes Canton, Carolines, Guam, Marianas, Midway, Okinawa, Palmyra, Ryukyus, Samoa, Swan, Tinian, and Wake Islands, etc.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield in order that I may make a similar request?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield under the same conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not object. I presume the matter has come in since my announcement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall wait until tomorrow morning.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

#### FEDERAL PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last year, while I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, I asked for and obtained a survey of governmental publications for the previous fiscal year. They amounted to an astounding number—between 83,000 and 84,000. I then determined that at some time I should like to acquaint the Members of the Senate and the people of the country with the results of the survey, and it has seemed to me, inasmuch as time was being consumed here, that this would be a very appropriate time to deal with a very worthy subject.

Mr. President, recently the President of the United States presented to the Congress his 1950 budget, calling for the largest peacetime expenditures this country has ever contemplated, almost \$42,000,000,000. So large were the demands for increased expenditures that it was indicated that even the revenues produced from our present record-breaking national income will not be sufficient to balance the books. In other words, unless we increase the present rate of taxation, we are going to be faced with deficit spending—deficit spending in the year of the greatest prosperity the country has ever known.

I am wholeheartedly in accord with the President's idea that we must not resort to unbalanced budgetary practices in years of plenty. If we are ever to reduce our mammoth debt of over \$250,000,000,000, we must do so now. Certainly we are only playing into the hands of the Kremlin cronies if we resort to deficit spending.

The administration's solution to this problem is to increase taxes. And I would be in favor of this method of budget balancing, too, if I were convinced

that this constituted the only solution to the problem.

But I am convinced that it is not. I shall continue with my present conviction until a sincere attempt is made to reduce expenditures by eliminating the waste, the extravagance, and the duplication of activity and personnel which today have supplanted economy and efficiency in our Federal Government.

I am certain in my own mind that we can balance the budget and reduce the debt without increasing taxes. We can do it by reducing appropriations. We can reduce appropriations without impairing a single necessary function of Government. Even those who doubt this assertion—in all fairness—should admit that it is worth a try.

For years now I have continued to protest against ever-mounting appropriations and expenditures which were not necessary to the essential welfare of the country. I am referring to those appropriations which may catch votes, but which weaken our financial strength. We all know which ones they are. We also know how frequently they are brought before this body.

I have recently heard the assertion made that there is much criticism of the size of our Government, of its profligate spending and waste, but that no one points out just where we can reduce.

This is just not so. I and a number of my colleagues have repeatedly pointed out specific places to cut the budget. I shall not take the time now to enumerate these soft spots. It would take too much time—and besides, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate today one particular soft spot which has been too long ignored.

#### PUBLICATION COSTS A SPENDING "SOFT SPOT"

I refer to the publication activities of the Federal Government. I recognize that what I am about to say will be printed and at public expense, but for once the cost of this printing will be more than repaid thousands, I hope, millions of times over, if the situation which I shall describe is attacked with vigor and sincerity by those persons in the Government who are responsible for the flood of unnecessary Government pamphlets that today clog the mails and plague the public. I am endeavoring on this occasion to relieve the strain on the eyes and pocketbooks of the American taxpayers caused by the facile and foolish pens of the Government authors who, consciously or otherwise, have foisted upon us a new WPA writers' project of gigantic proportions.

My attention was first drawn to this field of Government activity during budget hearings when I noticed ever-increasing estimates for printing and binding, when I heard budget officers justify larger printing and binding appropriations on the grounds of large backlogs of unpublished material, and when a large number of Federal publications began streaming across my desk whose very titles indicated that the Government bureaus had virtually taken all knowledge as their field.

I asked the staff of the Appropriations Committee last year to investigate and a wealth of information was uncovered. Some of this I want to pass on to my colleagues today.

#### OVER-ALL COSTS UNKNOWN

Because we have no cost accounting system in the Government, no over-all figures on publishing expenses are available. Unless we canvassed each department and agency and they, in turn, canvassed each of their bureaus and units, no Government-wide figures on publishing could be obtained. The cost factor and the time factor precluded such an ambitious program. Thus, no one knows how many publications are published by the Government. Nor does anyone have any idea of the ultimate cost to the public. We do not even know the number of personnel involved.

But we do know that the United States Government is the largest publishing house in the world. We know that the over-all costs run into many hundreds of millions of dollars. We know that thousands and tens of thousands of employees work full-time on the various phases of disseminating information.

I wish to state here that what I am about to say implies no criticism of the Government Printing Office. We have

found their records to be surprisingly complete. Furthermore, they have no power to limit the vast quantities of printed material which they turn out yearly for the entire Government.

Nor have I anything but praise for the efforts of my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Printing. Recently they have instituted changes in the regulations on printing and binding which will grant them more supervisory powers and which should provide the Congress with much needed and greater controls over printing and duplicating. What knowledge we do have of agency activity in this field—aside from that of the Government Printing Office—comes as a result of a recent survey made at the instance of the joint committee.

But, on the other hand, I do question the freedom exercised by many departments and agencies in spending vast sums of Federal money to publish material of little or no value. Of course, some of the projects involving expenditures other than for the printing and binding of authorized documents can be justified.

I do question their use of objects of expenditure other than the proper one to print and bind their documents unless so authorized.

I do question their duplication of information already made public by private sources or other Government agencies.

I do question their use of high-grade papers, their lavish use of illustrations, and their expensive formats.

In 1942 a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee sharply criticized several departments and agencies for their attempts through publications to propagandize the American public on controversial issues that were even then being debated in the Congress. I heartily agree that the public should not be taxed to pay for being propagandized, and I question this practice where it continues.

And I do question the advisability of the Government's having—in some cities—more than 20 separate printing and duplicating plants.

#### EIGHTY-THREE THOUSAND PUBLICATIONS SENT TO COMMITTEE

No one knows the number of publications which are printed and processed yearly by the Federal departments and agencies. That is a thing most people do not realize. Most people think that the printing of the Federal Government is all done in the city of Washington. In some cities in the United States the number of Federal agencies and bureaus runs into the hundreds. For instance, in the city of Chicago, the home city of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the present distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], there are 530 Federal agencies.

Now let us get back to printing. In San Francisco and in Philadelphia, for example, there are 20 separate printing and duplicating plants. Think of that. As I have said, most people think all the printing for the Federal Government is done in the Government Printing Office in the city of Washington, but all up and down this land, there is a vast array of

Federal offices and agencies, and there are printing offices, duplicating offices, and all kinds of offices turning out Government propaganda. It is a very interesting matter, and I want the Senate to listen to the story.

No one knows the number of publications printed and processed yearly by the Federal Government departments and agencies. Much of this is done through the Government Printing Office, and of these we have complete records, but much more is done by the agencies themselves in their own printing plants throughout the country, and through contracts with outside printing firms. For the committee, I asked each agency to submit one copy of each publication issued during the past fiscal year which went to the general public. I want Senators to understand this point. In the last fiscal year we asked for one copy of each publication these agencies printed and distributed to the general public. The response almost overwhelmed me. This is not something that goes back 9 or 10 years, but it applies to the last fiscal year. We received between 83,000 and 84,000 separate copies of separate booklets and pamphlets issued by individual departments of the Federal Government.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does the Senator mean by that that there are 83,000 separate documents dealing with 83,000 separate subjects?

Mr. BRIDGES. There are between 83,000 and 84,000 separate documents dealing with from 83,000 to 84,000 separate subjects.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did the Senator also learn how much the publications comprised in total volume?

Mr. BRIDGES. I can answer that as to some instances, but as to others the information was so weird and so far-reaching that it is necessary to make a general estimate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures the Senator has just given do not, I assume, include pamphlets of instruction to field agencies, and the like?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; they relate only to publications for distribution to the general public.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the Senator any figures as to the number of pamphlets of instruction issued to field agents?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we have no such figures. That is still another field. We could not go into that in such great detail; but it is still another field. For instance, I see present in the Chamber the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture, my good friend,

the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], whom I admire greatly. I make reference to him and his former Department only in passing, because of my admiration for him. He told us they could not send in certain types of information because if they did they would comprise a stack of publications 52 feet high. They had to do with agricultural extension work, and so forth, which we are not including in this list at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. The 83,723 publications, as I understand, do not include forms?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; they do not include forms. They are merely pamphlets and documents distributed to give information and propaganda to the general public.

I referred to one of the departments whose publications are not contained in this list. Even the eighty-three-odd-thousand publications which the committee received do not comprise more than a fraction of the total publications of the Government last year. They do not contain any of the multitude of publications which were issued solely for the internal workings of the Government. They exclude also thousands of publications which the agencies indicated would be expensive to collect. As I previously stated, one bureau begged off because its output would comprise a stack of publications estimated to be 52 feet high. Another begged off on a group which would fill, according to their own estimates, seven file cabinets of four drawers each. A third estimated that just one type of publication from that agency would fill a warehouse, if they could ever be collected. Remember, what I am talking about is just one copy of each publication going to the general public in the past fiscal year. I have not included the publications of the bureaus just referred to in the eighty-four-odd-thousand. Their publications are sort of bonuses on top of the eighty-three or eighty-four-odd thousand.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, went with me to the basement of the Capitol. I should like to have any Senator who wishes to do so take a little trip down there, because I believe it would be worth his while. If he would take a trip into the basement of the Capitol of the United States he would see rooms filled with publications of the sort I refer to. It is really an astonishing thing.

The Government Printing Office told me that in the past 10 years, from 1939 through 1948—and I have just received this figure—they delivered 133,582,867,587 copies of printed matter. Just think of that, Mr. President.

There are 140,000,000 people in this country. This is what they had to feed on. Just think of it. From the Government Printing Office alone—and it does not include the production of all the other plants over the country—came, during the 10-year period—133,582,867,587 copies of printed matter.

That printed matter is of sufficient volume to bury all 140,000,000 of our citizens. During the past 10 years enough printed matter has been put out by the Government Printing Office to cover and bury the 140,000,000 people in the United States. It would provide them safe coverage.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the people ought to feel fortunate that we have not passed a law compelling them to read these documents. Does not the Senator think that is true?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator is correct and I agree with him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. McMAHON. Are the Senator's speeches included in that number?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean—

Mr. McMAHON. If they are I was going to concur in the observation just made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am talking about the publications put out by the executive departments, but I am sure that if the speeches of the Senator from Connecticut were included they would make wonderful reading. I know that would be true, and I know that he would not press to have several billion of them distributed. Perhaps he would want printed only a sufficient number to cover the people of Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am familiar with the fact that the speeches made by Senators and Representatives are not included, and that the publications referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire included merely those put out in the executive branch.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator in position to affirm that the 133,000,000 copies of printed matter do not include the reprints of congressional and senatorial speeches?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is my understanding. Our request was for publications put out by executive departments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator know whether the total run of the printing office would include such delicate items as 500,000 reprints for one Member of Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will check that matter for the Senator. But we requested the run for the executive departments.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from New Mexico has the relative rate of mailing of executive and congressional publications? I have seen the figure from time to time, and my impres-

sion is that it runs at a ratio of about 20 to 1, but I will not make that as a statement. I know that I was considerably relieved when I found how much more profligate the executive department was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to observe to the Senator from New Hampshire that he is under no obligation to yield to other Members of the Senate for statements. He should yield only for questions.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And if other Senators interrupt to make statements of their own the Chair shall be reluctantly forced to rule that the Senator from New Hampshire has lost the right to the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Presiding Officer. I shall take heed and abide by that warning. I might say to the Senator from New Mexico, who made a statement as well as asked a question, that I do not know whether he did it with any ulterior purpose of making me lose the floor, but I would grant to him that he did it in all sincerity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not referring to any remark made by the Senator from New Mexico, but to the prior remarks made by the Senator from Michigan, and subsequently to remarks made by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I understand that the rules of the Senate do not apply to the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. BRIDGES. That I cannot answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate are impartial. The Chair was listening very carefully to the Senator from New Mexico, and he asked questions of the Senator from New Hampshire, but the Chair did not understand the Senator from Michigan to be asking a question, but rather as making a statement, and the Chair thought that the Senator from Maine was making a statement rather than asking a question of the speaker.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may I ask a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be happy if the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator now in the chair will examine the Record, and I should like to inquire, after they have done so, if they do not find there that the Senator from New Mexico stated very clearly that the Senator from New Hampshire was in error. If that is not a statement, I should be glad to be advised what it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We will read the Record very carefully tomorrow morning, sir, and in the meantime the Chair would like to caution the Senator from New Hampshire that he should yield only for questions directed to him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should be very much delighted to yield, if it is within my province to do so now, in order to have the Record read, if the Presiding Officer desires to determine the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no necessity for that. What the Chair said was not an attempt to take the Senator off his feet, but it was an attempt to protect the Senator against inquiries which might be made by some of the Senator's colleagues which would, unintentionally on their part, have that effect.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Presiding Officer for his consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course the Senator from Michigan believes that he was only asking questions. But the Chair has ruled otherwise. I ask the Senator if he can state whether or not during the time that these great volumes of publications were going out we were suffering from a paper shortage in the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to answer that question and say that during the period when these publications were going out we were suffering from the greatest paper shortage in the history of the country. I have no doubt that the printing of these publications, running as they did to terrific volume, into the billions, contributed very greatly to the paper shortage.

The publications I have referred to do not include the immense quantities of material turned out by the departments and agencies themselves. No one can tell, no one can even estimate the colossal magnitude of what these establishments have processed and printed on their own presses. However, some slight indication of the volume may be gleaned from a survey made at the instance of the Joint Committee on Printing in 1947. This showed that at that time there were 133 Government printing plants and 256 Government duplicating plants located through the country. One department had 44 printing plants. Another 41. Another 23. One agency had 100 duplicating plants. Another 43. In all, there were 32 departments and agencies with printing or duplicating plants located all over the country. One city had 25 plants. Another 23. Washington had 61.

And all this—mind you—does not include the Government Printing Office operation itself, which had 15 plants, since reduced to 9. Do Senators wonder when I tell them that it is impossible to estimate—impossible to overestimate—the volume of Government printing and processing that is done outside the Government Printing Office?

Is it any wonder that I am bothered when I know that far away from Washington, D. C., in the city of Chicago, located in the great State represented in part by the distinguished Presiding Officer at the present time, 530 Federal agencies and departments have offices? That is an astounding thing to me.

Take the home city of the whip of the majority [Mr. MYERS], the city of Philadelphia. Philadelphia has 25 printing plants. The city of Washington, where we think bureaucracy is concentrated, has only 61 printing plants. That is quite a number of plants, but when we

stop to think of the number of plants located in Philadelphia, which is not the capital of the country, perhaps 61 is not too high a figure for Washington.

One of the amazing characteristics of our Government is that it can carry on contradictory activities at the same time. I am not referring to the lady who wrote to me complaining that the Department of Interior's publication *How To Control Vagrant Cats* contradicts the purposes of National Cat Week sponsored by the Department of Commerce, although she may well have a good point.

I may say to the Presiding Officer that the woman who wrote me protesting against these two departments operating in conflict, with the Department of the Interior trying to control cats and the Department of Commerce sponsoring National Cat Week, came from Illinois. She is a very distinguished citizen of Illinois.

I hold in my hand a booklet which tells about how to control vagrant cats. On the first page there is a note as follows:

This leaflet supersedes United States Department of Agriculture leaflet 50, *How To Make a Cat Trap*, issued in November 1929—a contribution by the Bureau of Biological Survey.

The pamphlet tells about commercial live traps for cats.

Under the heading "Commercial live traps," we find the following:

There are several types of commercial live traps on the market that are effective in catching cats. They vary in door and trigger designs. Instructions for setting them are given by the manufacturers of the traps. They may be obtained through local hardware dealers or pet animal stores. These traps should be baited as described for the home-made trap.

Note this:

After it is determined that the captive cat is not a neighbor's pet, it may be disposed of by placing the wire trap in a tightly closed box and gassing as has been described. Instead of gassing, the animal may be drowned by submerging the trap in water.

We are getting into some pretty high stuff here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to make it a question. At least the pamphlet does give the option of two methods of killing a cat.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator asking me whether it does or not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Does it not give two methods of killing a cat?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The booklet goes into great detail. Once you catch the cat, the first thing you do is determine whether or not it is a neighbor's cat. If it is not a neighbor's cat, as I have quoted from the booklet, the directions are either to gas the cat, or if one does not like to gas a cat, the thing to do is to get a large tub and submerge the cat in the tub so that it will be drowned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not well known that a cat has nine lives? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out that one of the things that bothers me particularly—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish to reply to the question of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I have heard the report that a cat has nine lives, but I am not sure of it. It is not so stated in the booklet issued by the Government. That is one thing they forgot to tell. They forgot to tell whether a cat has nine lives or not.

The thing that bothers me particularly is that the woman from the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer is very sorely troubled. What is she troubled about? She is troubled because the Department of the Interior has issued a booklet on how to control vagrant cats. She says that that is in opposition to what the Department of Commerce is doing, because it is sponsoring National Cat Week. Mr. President, I think that it is a problem we ought to settle. It is too bad that the Government must publish thousands of booklets which raise a conflict in the minds of the people, and particularly this distinguished and outstanding woman from the home State of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take more time on cats. I shall have something to say about other animals, and other subjects.

It is a very interesting thing that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. I am referring to the seemingly paradoxical situation whereby one agency of the Government will offer the same publication free of charge to the public which another agency of the Government is attempting to sell. This is true of not just one publication. It is a general practice for the departments and agencies to offer free of charge—as long as the supply lasts—copies of publications which the Superintendent of Documents is attempting to sell at a nominal charge. Even then the Government loses money, for his sale is based, not on total cost—which, as I have indicated, is unobtainable—but on the reprint cost plus a mark-up.

Last year the Superintendent of Documents issued free of charge for the agencies—I repeat, free of charge—61,979,102 publications. How many million publications the agencies themselves issued free of charge, we cannot even surmise.

I would be remiss in my duties if I made this a blanket condemnation. I do not wish to be so understood. Many of these publications undoubtedly are highly necessary to the workings of our Government and the welfare of our citizens. Many of them, in all justice, should be distributed free of charge. Items on rat control and the prevention of forest fires, to mention only two, are of such nature that one could not expect general dissemination if a price were asked for them.

But this is not to condone the vast flood of free publications which daily clutter our mails. A businessman, for example, can conceivably secure 465 publications from the Department of Com-

merce free of charge by merely mailing a penny postcard to the Department. The Congress itself is not above criticism in this respect, as we all know.

Recently Senators received a communication from a Government agency which apologized to us because only 100 copies a month of a popular Government pamphlet could be furnished for the next several months because of higher publishing costs. I do not know how other Senators feel about it, but I am willing to take a dose of my own medicine. I am willing to take a lesser number of publications for free distribution to help the cause of lowering the cost of publications. In the long run the people are not getting these publications free of charge; the cost is not paid directly, but it is paid indirectly in higher taxes.

In consequence, I hope my colleagues here and in the House of Representatives will join with me in a conscientious endeavor to order only such publications for distribution to our constituents as will really be of use to them. Let us continue to send them Infant Care, and let us think twice before we send them publications on Eliminating Bats from Buildings.

The bat is an interesting animal. Bats sometimes trouble people. The longer I remain in Washington the more trouble I have with bats. I have met a great many batty people here. Most of them I have found in certain Government departments. They all make some contribution, of course.

Perhaps Senators would like to hear something about how to get rid of bats:

The most satisfactory and the only permanent way of obtaining freedom from the bat-roost nuisance, however, is to shut the bats out.

[Laughter.]

That is quite an effective way, Mr. President; I think that is one of the best things that could be done in that connection. Incidentally, the title of this portion of the pamphlet is Bat-Proofing Buildings."

I read further from it:

Frequently there are only a few small entrances to the bat roost, and in such cases bat-proofing is relatively simple. It is necessary only to close the openings—

And so forth. Then I find this:

In closing the entrances used by bats it is necessary that one or two be left open until after nightfall, so as to allow egress of the bats, and thus shut them out and not in. Ordinarily during midsummer all the bats will have left the roost within 15 minutes from the time the first one starts, but after their accustomed routine has been thus upset, several hours may lapse before the last bat finds its way out.

In other words, sometimes there is a laggard, and one or two of the bats might linger behind. That would be very serious.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was called out of the Chamber for a few minutes, so I have not heard all the Senator's discussion. I wonder whether he has yet reached the subject of dogs. Is there any information dealing with the maternity problem

of dogs and their descendants? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall discuss the dog situation a little later; but I should like to have the Senator remain while I discuss an item which very directly concerns dogs. A booklet which has been published at considerable cost to the Federal Government will be, I think, of real interest in that connection. The booklet is on fleas. That is a very highly controversial issue, and it has to do with the dog situation, and I shall discuss it.

In fact, I now hold that booklet in my hand. It is entitled "Fleas of North America." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this booklet appears to be quite a publication. The subtitle is "Classification, identification, and geographic distribution of fleas." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I should like to read some of the material contained in the booklet. I hope that all Senators will listen to the reading of this material, for I am quite sure they will be interested in this, too.

I now read from the booklet:

In the United States, fleas are serious pests of dogs—

So, Mr. President, dogs come into this matter. The complete sentence is as follows:

In the United States, fleas are serious pests of dogs, of cats, and of poultry. Dogs may be greatly annoyed by fleas, when attacked, and spend much time gnawing at their affected parts.

That is a great contribution, Mr. President—to learn that when fleas attack dogs, the dogs have to spend a large part of their time gnawing at the affected parts.

I hope Senators will listen to this, and they should listen carefully, if they wish to understand what is the most frequently affected part. The booklet says:

The most frequently affected part is the back, near the root of the tail.

[Laughter.]

As a result of fleas, that part of the dog—the root of the tail—becomes, so we are told by the booklet, raw and sore, and infection often follows. So we see that quite a big problem exists in this country in that connection; and we have this booklet, entitled "Fleas of North America—Classification, Identification, and Geographic Distribution of Fleas," to which we can turn. As we are told by this publication, the place to look on the dog is near the root of the tail; that is where the greatest trouble with fleas is, according to this booklet.

Mr. President, there are many other phases of this subject of fleas. This booklet comprises 142 pages, so it is apparent that many different angles in regard to fleas must be covered by this publication. I think it is something very worth while that we should pursue. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not wish to become at all personal, but I may say that this publication is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture; it is Miscellaneous Publication No. 500. I do not know whether the distinguished former

Secretary of Agriculture, now a Member of this body, could add any more than I have added in regard to the problem of identifying fleas, and so forth; but I shall do the best I can.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question only?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; for a question only.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has the Senator been familiar with the work done by the Department of Agriculture laboratory in Florida on the development of cures for this problem within the past few years?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not criticizing that; I am merely talking about the publications the Department issues. I am not blaming the former Secretary of Agriculture at all. I am simply enlightening the Senate and the country in regard to some of the publications the Government issues, and this one was a particularly good one, it seemed to me. Frankly, I picked out only certain sections; I did not wish to read the entire 142 pages, so I picked out some of the pages which I thought would be of particular interest.

Now let me discuss the matter of the mailing list for such Government publications. Even the free distribution of publications has not been sufficient inducement to the public to gobble up this horde of printed documents. Let me explain. After an agency orders a publication printed by the Government Printing Office, the agency receives a supply it believes sufficient for its immediate needs. It arranges with the Printing Office to distribute another large group, supplying addressograph plates for the purpose. The Printing Office at present has a collection of over 2,000,000 addressograph plates which they must use to send out publications for the agencies. The agencies do not pay for this service, which runs to over \$300,000 annually.

The remaining supply of publications is retained by the Government Printing Office as stock available for free distribution. The storage space the Printing Office has for this free stock is limited to about 35,000 square feet. Tons of undistributed publications dating back for many years serve as mute but concrete evidence of waste and extravagance resulting from poor administrative judgment that has come from overstocking of publications. Other unknown tons have been transferred to agency warehouses or sold as waste paper. The Government Printing Office is constantly pleading with the departments and agencies to remove their dead stock. I suspect they are fearful of the contingency whereby they would be forced out of their own building by surplus publications ordered by Government agencies.

During the past 2 years the Government Printing Office condemned over 10,000,000 publications. No one knows how many were condemned by the other Government establishments.

Committee investigators found widespread evidence of undistributed publications. Over 500,000 copies of some publications were found. And there were many publications of which there were from two to three hundred thousand copies available. They had lain there

for several years—untouched and unwanted.

PRINTING AND BINDING COSTS A FRACTION OF TOTAL

I am afraid that there are many of us in the Congress who have been misled as to the cost of the Government's publishing activities. The Bureau of the Budget recently estimated that the overall printing and binding cost for the entire Government in fiscal 1948 was approximately \$45,000,000. This, of course, does not include the cost of the original research, the editing, the typing, the reviewing and checking, and the distribution. In fact, the committee discovered that in certain instances it does not even include a large part of the printing and binding costs themselves.

One large agency of the Government made an independent check on its publishing activities and discovered that printing and binding activities accounted for only about 25 percent of the total cost of processing the material from the manuscript to the printed page. And even this, it must be emphasized, did not include any costs whatever for research, writing, and distribution.

The head of another agency revealed that the distribution cost alone of a particular document came to five times the cost of printing it.

Still another agency admitted that the printing and binding cost of just one publication came to three times as much as they had secured from the Congress for printing all their publications.

It is apparent then that the object classification of printing and binding is but a part—probably a very small part—of the total costs of publishing in the Government.

With such figures as a guide—fragmentary as they are—one may well wonder how many hundreds of millions of dollars these publications are costing the people of this Nation.

It is apparent, also, that many departments and agencies have resorted to processing publications in their own plants to avoid congressional limitations imposed on printing and binding appropriations.

Moreover, the Congress itself has been remiss in this matter, for we have been told for a number of years by the Public Printer in his annual reports—and in unmistakably clear language—that the situation had gotten beyond his control. I, as one Member of the Congress, join with the Public Printer in urging a discontinuance of these wasteful practices and a general strengthening—without censorship—of the controls over publications of the executive branch.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly; for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator from New Hampshire advise the Senate whether there is a strict rule in regard to what may be published or printed in the Government Printing Office itself for a department or agency of the Government?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it is supposed to be something pertaining to the work of the department; but I think that al-

lows quite a good deal of latitude—too much, in fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator advise the Senate whether any of the publications are printed in foreign countries?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator advise the Senate why that is done, or how it happens to be done?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think we filled up all the printing offices in this country, and had to expand, so to speak, in other countries, in order to get the printing done.

UNCLE SAM'S BOOK-OF-THE-MINUTE CLUB, UNLIMITED

At this time I should like to call your attention to some of these volumes which are issued by our Government agencies. I have not examined all of the publications carefully. It would take years to do a thorough job on that. Therefore, in bringing them to your attention, I do not wish to imply and I do not wish to have inferred, that I necessarily am critical of any one volume. I merely bring them to your notice at this time because I, for one, was amazed at some of the volumes I uncovered, and because I thought you would be interested in the variety of titles, the subject matter of many, and the format and binding of others. There may be valid reasons for some of the pamphlets, books, brochures, and other printed material which I am about to bring to your attention, but all of them contain questionable passages, questionable material, and many are overelaborate and costly of presentation.

This modest little book I hold in my hand is entitled "Tales From Korea." It is a book containing 143 pages. It is a very worth-while book. It was printed at Government expense and was widely distributed.

From the introduction to the book I read the following:

Mr. Pyun offers us a collection of Korean tales, myths, fairy stories, and folk tales. You will find old friends, such as Brer Rabbit and Cinderella, dressed it is true in Korean clothes; Brer Rabbit speaking in Korean idioms instead of darky dialect, Cinderella riding in a sedan chair instead of a coach and four, but nonetheless truly the same old friends half the way round the world from where we met them last.

From the foreword I read the following:

Many will perhaps disagree about the way the native names are rendered in this book, and feel that the doubtful improvement it brings does not quite compensate for the shock one is likely to feel in a humorless travesty.

It continues with various descriptions.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would it be contended we were wasting our time in a discussion of this character?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say, in answer to the Senator, I do not see how that could be contended because certainly the administration should not be ashamed of any document it issues—84,000 individ-

ual copies of publications on various subjects—for free distribution all over this country and all over the world. I should say we are merely bringing to light certain illuminating facts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it the Senator's feeling that the Senate and the country should be informed of the nature of the publications in order that they may determine whether they feel it is an appropriate matter for public expenditure?

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly do. I was going to say the volume, *Tales From Korea*, a very interesting book of 148 pages, was published for general distribution. It contains some very interesting pictures, too. It was printed at Government expense. The book was written by Y. T. Pyun, and the dedication placed in this booklet, printed at Government expense, reads:

To my wife who mothers five children as well as our common son.

That is a very lofty dedication of a Government publication—"To my wife who mothers five children as well as our common son." I desire to go over some of the things with which he deals in the various chapters. He has one little story entitled "The Vanity of the Rat." That ought to be particularly important. Another one is "The Old Woman and the Tiger." The next one is "The Traveler and the Tiger." Then there comes one in which he really gets down to work—"The Origin of the Sun and the Moon." We all want to hear about that. I do not have time to read the chapter, but his discussion of the "Origin of the Sun and the Moon" ought to be very good. Another title is "The School Boy and the Fox." Another one is "The Strange Dream." That ought to be very appropriate here, I think. Another one is "Lies Rewarded With a Bride." That ought to have some particular appeal. Another is "The White-Eared Tiger." That ought to be of particular appeal to people. Another one is "The Absent-Minded Man." I shall not take more time on this, which merely shows the variations of the Government publication situation.

I should have here a pamphlet on Women in Radio, which I wanted to discuss with Senators. That is a very laudable subject, something I think quite worth while. It is put out by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Most of it deals with biographical sketches of women who have become well known as the result of their radio activities. It is one of an extensive series on woman's place in various occupations. It is published, among other things, for the woman who wants to go into radio, and maps out for her her whole life career, going into all the various matters in which she might be interested.

I have another booklet here, which I think will be of great interest, called *Federal Duck Stamps, and Their Place*. This is a very interesting story about Federal duck stamps. The booklet also includes Canadian goose, the pin-tailed duck, the canvasback duck, the green-winged teal, the black duck, the white duck, the white-front goose, the red-headed duck, and the snow goose. To all

these creatures we have apparently devoted this little booklet; which presumably contributed somewhat to our influence.

Various other publications have been issued, such as *Getting Into a Different Thing*, *Farm Fishponds*, *Techniques of Fishpond Management*, *Farm Fishponds and Their Management*, all of which is good and of varying interest to various people.

Another one is entitled "Family Spending and Saving, as Related to Age of Wife and Age and Number of Children." This is crammed full of interesting facts; for example:

Did you know that "among the young families without children, wives tended to spend more on their wardrobes than husbands"?

That ought to be interesting. That is page 33, paragraph 2. That is gone into in some detail.

Did you know that "almost one-fourth—23 percent—of the wives 60 or older at an income" below \$1,000 "spend so little for dress that they used less than 30 percent of the family's clothing funds, leaving the balance for their husbands"?

Husbands seem to be getting the better of this deal.

In paragraph 1, page 19, the book tells how they conducted a survey of what women discuss, and they found that they always talked about their grocery bills, instead of about something really interesting.

I now come to another one. Here is a book on *Estimating the Muskrat Population by House Counts*. It is quite a book. I am sure it must be contributing something to the great good of the country. I do not know just where to start. It contains 17 pages, so I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into it. It has very many interesting things in it regarding the census method used, and all about the general situation.

Another booklet, which is a very good one, is entitled "Fish for Breakfast—And Why Not?" That is very good. In this booklet we find some very interesting quotations. Persons from the Middle West would be interested in this. It says:

The national stand-by of bacon and eggs is all very well, but some people find that such a breakfast dish is too rich, and, in any case, the possibilities for variety are strictly limited.

So they recommend fish for breakfast. It says further:

Perhaps the reason that those few minutes' extra sleep seem preferable to breakfast is that the breakfast menu has become drab and monotonous.

So they recommend fish. That is a good thing. I come from a State that has some seacoast, and we catch some fish from the sea and some from the very fine lakes in New Hampshire. I like fish. This publication contains a recipe for "kedgerees." That is a special kind of a fish preparation. It is made with flaky fish and is cooked with rice, hard-boiled eggs, and so on. The publication goes into all kinds of things.

Here is a very interesting one on attracting birds. It starts off by saying:

Formerly there seemed to be no question about the desirability of attracting birds.

Now certain doubts have arisen in the minds of people as to whether it is wise to attract them or not.

So there is a disagreement. It says further:

Birds, as a rule, not only do not want bird neighbors too near, but are impatient with human meddling, and therefore should be granted as much privacy as possible.

So we should pay some attention to that.

The greatest reward from attracting birds—doubtless also in most cases the main incentive for the practice—is human enjoyment. The activity, beauty, and songs of birds supply life, color, and charm. Birds ornament the homestead, entertain the senses, and afford natural companionship that is a joy to a majority of mankind. They are so keen and spritely that they compel attention, so intensively alive and so in harmony with their environment as to inspire the beholder.

I could go on, but I do not wish to cover the whole field.

Here is another interesting publication, issued in recent weeks, entitled "Two Home-Made Traps for English Sparrows." It should be very interesting. In New Hampshire there is a dispute going on as to whether we should name the chickadee as the State bird. I am sure that if we could obtain a supply of these booklets and send them to New Hampshire, this particular one on how to make home-made traps for English sparrows, they might be able to catch some of the chickadees and examine them a little more carefully.

Here is a pamphlet entitled "Suggestions for Combating Objectionable Roosts of Birds—With Special Reference to Those of Starlings." That gets right down to Washington. The starlings in Washington are birds that cause some embarrassment, not only as to the Capitol, but to various buildings, including some of the statues. Washington is a beautiful city of statues, but we seem to have a major problem in connection with the starlings.

Here is a booklet which has been issued for general circulation on how to deal with the starling problem. That should be one of the most interesting problems that we could tackle here.

Here is one showing how to make a table lamp. It says that the first thing is—

Be sure to buy a socket with a three-position switch if you use a three-light bulb (50-100-150-watt).

It goes on at some length. It says:

It conserves eyesight, saves energy, and gives your room new attractiveness. You can make one, cheaply and easily, with materials readily available.

Here is another one that really gets home. Its title is "Care of Parrots." The care of parrots is probably one of the major problems of the country, and here is a little booklet on the care of them. It contains 16 pages and deals with parrot fever. It also deals with the difficulty in refeathering after molt. It speaks of egg-binding. I do not know what is meant by that. It must be something new in the science of caring for parrots. There are all kinds of angles to the parrot situation. The publication goes into

details and covers quite a good deal of ground.

Here is one entitled "Feeding and Caring for Squirrels." That should not be a major problem, because I can remember that when I was a small child—I could not have been more than 2 or 3 or 4 years of age—I used to go out in the backyard and feed peanuts to squirrels. I had not had the advantage of having read a United States Government booklet on how I should feed squirrels.

I went through Boston, Mass., a few days ago. The Senator from Massachusetts knows all about Boston Common. I saw beautiful squirrels there, and I saw little tots feeding peanuts to them. I do not know whether the Senator knows, and I shall not ask him here, whether the people of Massachusetts have read about how to feed squirrels so that they will know the best way to hand a peanut to a squirrel. It must be a very efficient Government operation.

The next booklet is a very worth-while one, entitled "Establishing and Operating a Flower Shop."

As business gets a little dead in this Democratic administration it might be well to look into this booklet. When we got the Fair Deal I did not think we would get into anything like the situation we are in, so I think we ought to begin to think about new types of business. Here is a booklet which is rather a lengthy one, containing all kinds of diagrams. It is 46 pages long, telling about how to go into the flower business so that we can have more flowers.

Here is a booklet entitled "Establishing and Operating a Year-Round Motor Court." It devotes 125 pages to telling how to operate a motor court. A motor court is a very useful thing in our life in the United States as we travel over the country. I see the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is present. Persons in his section of the country have been able to operate motor courts rather successfully. Persons come along in their automobiles and have to stop somewhere overnight. They do not want to sleep in their cars, so they go into a motor court. Here is a booklet of 125 pages as an aid to conducting that business.

Here is one to which I want the Senators to pay particular attention. I know the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is a very distinguished gentleman and he likes to solve major problems. Here is one into which I do not think he has looked. This publication is entitled "The Cuban Frog Leg Industry." The Government is issuing publications on the Cuban frog-leg business. I wish I had time to go into many of the features in connection with the frog-leg business. Much of it is very interesting. I see that one of the subheads is "The Age for Prime Frog Legs." That is something I did not know about. I shall quote from that for a moment. In Cuba some frogs are known to live longer than others. [Laughter.] That is very interesting.

In Cuba some frogs are known to live as much as 7 years or longer. For commercial purposes to insure tender meat—

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. For a question into

Mr. BRICKER. Does the pamphlet show any way to calculate how far a frog can jump by the length of his legs? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not found that in the pamphlet as yet. I will see. I shall go on with this, because it is interesting. It says that some frogs live longer than others, and some as long as 7 years. Then it says:

For commercial purposes to insure tender meat, however, only those at least 1 year old (after reaching the frog stage)—

Get that—

and not older than 2 years old are taken, because those younger than 1 year are not economical and those older than 2 years are not sufficiently tender.

That is really solving a major problem. I wish the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, had been here earlier. I shall not take his mind off other things now, but I have had some very interesting letters from people in Illinois, and I discussed them with the present distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is now presiding. But I am sure that if the senior Senator from Illinois will read the RECORD tomorrow, he will get some real inspiration.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot let the Senator interfere with me, because I might lose the floor. [Laughter.] I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will my distinguished friend yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator tell the Senate and the country why the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is an indefatigable worker, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years, did not find out about these frogs when he was Chairman of that Committee, when these same pamphlets were being issued, and he had the power and the Republican Party had the power to stop the issuance of them?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will answer that. In the first place, I cannot speak for the Senator from Vermont, because I do not see him here in the Chamber. The Senator from Illinois referred to the "Senator from Vermont." The Senator from Illinois occasionally knows I am the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am very proud of the fact that I am. I occasionally go into Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I accept the apology. These publications were collected during the past two years, when the Republicans were in control of the Congress. We have had to assemble them, and I am just making them known. If the Senator from Illinois and his Administration want to balance the budget and to get things done, what he should do, instead of rooting up subjects for new taxes on people, is to undertake to cut down some of the Government publications. That is one way he could render the people of Illinois a real service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that by eliminating the frogs we could balance the budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say that by eliminating some of the publications on frog's legs, which I have not had time to go into, we would help balance the budget, and to that end I invite the cooperation of the Senator from Illinois.

The next publication I have is another very interesting one, "The Cuban Shark Industry." Mind you, if we were talking about how to raise Hereford cattle, something practical in this country, I would be for it. But Cuba is not like the Hawaiian Islands, a territory of the United States. Cuba is an independent country. Yet we are organizing the frog industry there and now we are organizing the shark industry. There is very wide diversification in this pamphlet, and many fine pictures, and 27 pages of how to organize the shark industry.

To show that we have no prejudice against any particular country, the next one I have here is a pamphlet on Venezuela. The Venezuelan Salt Fish Industry. That is quite a publication, with maps and pictures—81 pages on the Venezuelan salt fish industry.

I cannot go into all these; it would take several hours merely to name them. But we have no prejudice. We will do something about any matter that comes along.

Now, here really is one; and I hope the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, will give a little attention to this. I have one here now which I think will really catch his eye. It is Recipes for Cooking Muskrat Meat. [Laughter.] This is a very fine publication, and I assume from what it says that muskrat meat must be quite a delicacy.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. For a question.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator ever tried it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have never tried it. I have quite an inspiration since I have been reading this booklet, but I have never tried muskrat meat yet. However, I want to tell some of the ways it should be cooked. This is put out by the administration of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is the majority leader, and I want him to be informed as to what his administration is doing. They give a fine recipe here for fried muskrat. Then they have another one for muskrat fried in wine. That would have a particular appeal. It might even appeal to a wider variety of people than just plain fried muskrat. Then we have smothered muskrat. That ought to be pretty good. Then we get into broiled marsh rabbit, and so forth.

Here is one from Maryland. I do not see either of the Senators from Maryland on the Senate floor, but we have Maryland shredded muskrat meat. That must be a super de luxe dish.

Here is another one, muskrat meat with tomato sauce. I always like catsup and I think tomato sauce would take some of the taste away.

Here is another that I did not think they could do—muskrat salad.

Another one is stewed muskrat liver, with onions.

Here are two more, indeed, three more. One is pickled muskrat. That should be good. The second is muskrat pie, and the other one is muskrat a la Louisianne. [Laughter.] That ought to be pretty good.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether in the exploration of these various publications, particularly on this matter of edibility the Senator has found one which deals with the matter of how to cook and eat crow.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not run into that yet, but if I do, I should like very much to talk about it. I have not yet discovered anything on that subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not know whether the distinguished majority side had planned that for Republican edification or not, but I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Illinois might also have investigated the matter of eating crow in connection with the current discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot speak for the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield to me—

Mr. BRIDGES. For a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator agree with me that if pamphlets did come out on how to eat crow, they ought to come definitely from the Republicans, and not the Democrats?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would have some question about that, but I would say there was a period last November when that might be true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for another question—

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As to whether or not the current conditions in the Senate might indicate that the majority leader might be eating crow very shortly? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say that from my general knowledge—I have no specific knowledge—that is entirely possible, but I should not care to say definitely, because I have great respect for the Senator from Illinois, and I want him to have perfect latitude and not be influenced by anything I might say along that line. [Laughter.]

Here is another one that is pretty good, "Deer mortality from gunshot wounds." I like to go hunting, and I think it is a very worth-while sport. It is a subject which should be gone into, but I do not know just how anyone, however wise he may be, could prepare an accurate publication on that subject.

Here is something very good. Here is a document of 115 pages on Certain Child-Welfare Terms in Spanish, Portuguese, French, and English. I can understand the ones in English. There may be some reason for the others. But I will say we are going a little far afield when the Government issues free publications of 115 pages, translating these very endearing young terms into four different languages.

Here is another pamphlet which is very good. It is entitled "Mist Netting for Birds in Japan." We go over into Asia now, into the Far East, to consider things done there. This publication is about 40 pages. It contains a number of nice pictures. It deals with mist netting for birds in Japan. As I said there are many pretty pictures in the pamphlet. I do not believe I shall go into this pamphlet. I merely wish to say that it proves we are not prejudiced in the matter of putting out pamphlets dealing with other countries.

Here is one which has real appeal. It is entitled "Music While You Work." We could talk about such a thing as that for the Senate. If we could arrange to have music while we work on the Senate side of the Capitol it would be worth while. The pamphlet contains something like 60 pages on how best to provide music while we work.

We now go to the farm. I hold in my hand a pamphlet entitled "Your Farm House. Planning the Bathroom." Listen to this:

Whether you are putting a new bathroom into an old house or building everything new, plan the bathroom to fit your family's present and future needs. Let every one in the family, young and old, join in the planning. Here are just a few of the many questions you will want to talk over before you make your final plans.

Will dad and the boys coming in from work use the bathroom as a washroom, or can you build a separate washroom? Can you plan your bathroom to meet the special needs of the children or sick or aged members of the family? Do you need bathroom space to bathe and dress a baby?

Will there be a morning rush on the bathroom?

That is an important subject.

Perhaps you need a bathroom that several persons can use at one time.

That would be a wonderful thing. We have something there, Mr. President. I can remember when I was in college, living in a boarding house. There were three floors in the house. On the floor I lived there was one bathroom. I think there were 12 boys who lived on that floor. We all made a dash for the bathroom at one time. Of course we were all of one sex, and that did not cause as much embarrassment as if there had been mixed sexes living there. But we made a dash for the bathroom, and it would have been ideal if we could have had there to advise us the planner who put out the pamphlet.

I continue to read:

Perhaps you need a bathroom that several persons can use at one time.

I have been thinking about how that would work. It would be rather a difficult thing at best, even for the very astute minds of some of the planners we have here in Washington to figure out how that could be done in one bathroom. I can see how there could be a multiplicity of receptacles there, and that perhaps several persons could use the bathroom at one time, but I cannot understand how the planners could arrange it so the bathroom could be used by any great crowd at the same time. Yet, that is one of the solutions we are offering on the

part of the United States Government, for such a problem.

The pamphlet says:

Always plan in advance.

That is a good thing to do. If we could sort of apportion the time of those who use the bathroom it would be very worth while.

Here is a pamphlet I got from the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It deals with the Columbia Basin. It is entitled "Columbia Basin—Joint Investigations—Farm Improvement." The pamphlet consists of 126 pages. I shall not have time to go into all of it. But there were several things contained in it that I particularly wanted to read to the Senate.

Home-furnishing needs are discussed. I hope the distinguished Presiding Officer is not going to leave, because I want him to hear this. I think it is very worth while. I know the Senator from Illinois to be a very learned man, with a very fine educational background, but I think he can learn some new things from what I am saying today. He may hear something he has probably never even imagined before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will pay very close attention to what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. I read:

Roughly, three kinds of furnishings deserve consideration: Furniture, appliances, and accessories. The most important pieces among the first will be davenports, chairs, tables, pianos, radios, beds, and storage pieces—

And so forth and so on. Now we come down to something else:

Second, the pieces must satisfy the settler's taste. This is one of the more difficult problems to resolve. The average ruralist seems to feel his daily routine to be rather unexciting and in selecting home furnishings he is likely to satisfy his consequent craving for glamour by choosing flashy pieces.

Mr. President, I do not like that statement. I do not like to have that said with respect to the people of the State of the Senator from Washington. That is a direct reflection by the bureaucrats in Washington upon the taste of the people of that State. I rather resent that, because I think the farmers in the State of Washington, and the Columbia River Basin, at least those I have met, have pretty good judgment. I do not want to have reflections cast upon them any more than I would like to have reflections cast upon the farmers of the State of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. Apparently, the bureaucrat who wrote the pamphlet thinks that the farmers of Washington, in the Columbia Basin, go in for glamour by choosing flashy pieces. I continue to read:

Ponderous davenports covered with brilliantly colored pile fabrics, refrigerators with much brightwork, highly figured rugs and wallpaper, elaborate pictures and accessories—these are the sort of things that may tempt him. He is likely to pass up the simpler articles and spend extra money he can ill afford to buy pieces with more class.

I realize that the bureaucrat who wrote the pamphlet believes as he wrote, but I

cannot bring myself to condemn people in the State of Washington, as he does by what he writes. It is a matter which has been troubling me ever since I read it, and I will say to the senior Senator from Washington, that I felt bound to bring it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire think that probably the purpose of the pamphlet is to sort of educate all the settlers we expect to come to our State, to the Columbia Basin, from New England and the middle west, to the real simple way of life in Washington, and to warn them not to bring their fancy ideas of the East with them when they come to our State?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think so, I will say to the Senator. I believe the Senator's friends there are perfectly competent to take care of themselves in this respect without needing such aid as is attempted to be provided in the pamphlet. I am sure that such a thing as this is rather of a questionable nature. But I will say in all candor to the Senator that I simply do not like the reflection that is cast upon the Senator's people by what I have read.

I read further:

It is not suggested that the farmer's taste is bad and that he must be saved from himself and made to buy only the proper things selected by trained decorators. Rather it is proposed that the desires which cause him to select a special type of furnishings shall be analyzed and those desires satisfied with items which individually and together are good buys.

Now that is a part of the collective state, as I see it. It is not proposed even to let the farmer in Washington buy what he wants. The bureaucrats seem to be afraid the farmer might have bad taste. So they are going to analyze him and analyze his desires for the items individually, so they can guide him in the direction of the type of things he had best buy.

I do not want to discuss the pamphlet further, but I suggest it is a subject which the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire should look into more fully, because it is a sort of a reflection on some of our best people.

Here is a very nice pamphlet. It is entitled "Habits, Food, and Economic Status of the Band-Tailed Pigeon." Now we are getting into a new field—the habits, food, and economic status of the band-tailed pigeon. That is really a new matter. I am not very familiar with the band-tailed pigeon, but here we have a pamphlet of 76 pages on the subject of the habits, the food, and the economic status of the band-tailed pigeon. I cannot go into it in great detail, Mr. President, but I think Senators will be interested in one paragraph which tells about the courtship of the band-tailed pigeon:

Apparently little is recorded concerning the courtship of the band-tail. Bent (1932), quoting Swarth, indicates that cooing and other calls and spectacular circling glides by the male from a perch are among the details of courtship.

That is very interesting. The male starts to coo, and he coos a little and calls a little, and then he does circular gliding movements from a perch. That indicates the start of the courtship.

Pearse (1935) describes another activity, apparently part of the courting behavior. Short flights in a hesitant, quivering manner, during which the bird seems almost to float, form the basis of this display. The tail is fully spread, and Pearse says that the tips of the wings appear to be held down. The display is accompanied by two separate very low calls, one of which he describes as being very like the modified chirping of a cricket.

I should like to read another paragraph under the heading "Calls." This has relationship to the courtship of the band-tailed pigeon.

The deep, cooling notes of the band-tailed pigeon are distinctive. Once heard, as they ring through the depths of some mountain canyon, they will never be forgotten. Mrs. Florence Merriam Bailey (1902) terms the calls owl-like. They are most often heard during the courting period, and Wales (1926) describes the tilting of the head downward to horizontal, the inflation of the neck, and other actions incident to the display of that particular period.

The courting period of the band-tailed pigeon is an important period in its life. I can believe that.

After nesting has begun, the cooling is more subdued and less frequent.

A variety of low guttural call notes may be heard when the parents are together at or near the nest: these are similar to the notes of the domestic pigeon at such times.

After the courtship is over and the nesting period has begun, they act like ordinary pigeons.

The squab, when hungry, utters a thin, piping note. Neither of these latter calls can be heard for more than a few yards.

That is a book which I think everyone should look into. Senators should carry it in their brief cases, because it gives inspiration to go on. If we can get down to the details of the courtship of the band-tailed pigeon, we certainly ought to be able to do something about humans.

The State Department sent to the committee approximately 20 volumes which it issued for South American distribution. Every one of these volumes is in Spanish. One group is highly technical and professional. I am limited to English and a smattering of French which I acquired many years ago when I was in college. I am not an authority on Spanish. If any Senator is a Spanish scholar, I think he would be very much interested in some of these books. They are not inexpensive books. The one I hold in my hand contains 847 pages. It deals with some of the details of human relations. It is printed in Spanish, and we are sending it to other countries for their use. It is a pretty good book to have in one's library.

There is another group of publications, which I shall not take the time to discuss in detail. Here is one which is very interesting, on *Moby Dick*. It has been translated into Spanish. The book contains 700 pages, and is very elaborate.

Mr. President, I could continue citing examples like these for hours, but I shall not take the time to do so. There are

one or two more publications which I should like to discuss.

This one is entitled "Among the Birds in the Grand Canyon Country." Let me quote from it:

One night after a thunderstorm over the North Rim, while the stars were still hidden, the moon gave a soft light through which the large landscape features could be discerned. Under the turreted South Rim our amphitheater walls led down in gigantic dark silhouetted steps lowering to the mesa; and beyond across the width of the great chasm was faintly seen the far-away familiar level of the North Rim. But as I gazed around dreamily, the soft, soothing voices of little toads, the drowsy chirring of crickets, and the faint poor-will, poor-will, soon lulled me into peaceful sleep.

That is what we paid for. We not only paid for the printing, but we paid for the trip and all the research. This author had some amazing experiences. They are almost startling. I took the book home and read it. It made me wish that I could take a trip out there next year.

The next publication is entitled "List and Index of Department of the Army Publications." One does not need to take the time to go through the Army publications. He can consult this list of all the publications issued by the Army. They concern almost every subject in the world.

There is another publication to which I think I should refer. It has to do with how to tell the sex of a watermelon. I think that is a very interesting thing. It is a subject which we should look into, and probably give some study. The pages in this publication are not numbered, but my guess is that it contains from 20 to 25 pages. It deals with a very heavy subject. When we come to determining the sex of a watermelon, it really taxes the brain of the average citizen, because that is a major subject. I know that some distinguished Senators come from States where watermelons are produced in great quantities. I like watermelons. I have spent some time either cultivating or eating them, but never determining their sex or studying their sex life. But I can appreciate that the sex life of a watermelon might be a very interesting subject to study. It certainly could do no one any harm. It would be perfectly harmless reading. If one could become proficient in determining the sex of a watermelon he could probably make some contribution—as much as many of our bureaucrats are making—to the country as a whole.

I cannot even pronounce the title of the next publication, but it consists of 49 pages. In one of the chapters there is discussed the cross between a goose and a swan. The goose is a commercial bird, something in which we are all interested. A good fat goose to eat is delicious, and goose feathers are of commercial importance. I do not know what we would gain by crossing a goose with a swan; but here we have a chapter on how to cross a goose with a swan.

Another chapter in this book is entitled "A New Name for the Japanese Blue Magpie." It tells why the Japanese blue magpie should be named differently.

Another chapter describes a hybrid between an Emden goose and a mute

swan. Mr. President, I do not know what a mute swan is. This tells how they were kept in the Munich Zoo, and lists three other known records of that hybrid; and they call the cross between the Emden goose and the mute swan a swoose. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, we have a chapter on the swoose, which is a new thing in bird language, and one of the things we are contributing our tax money to develop in various ways.

Mr. President, the subject I have been discussing is the result of a survey made by the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate last year, and finished then. Sometimes I have wished to discuss some things regarding it. Today I have discussed perhaps 50 of these pamphlets; but if Senators will come with me to the basement of the United States Capitol, the building in which we stand now—and, Mr. President, I should be delighted to escort you and other Senators down there—I can show them in one of the rooms in this building between 83,000 and 84,000 booklets and pamphlets, individual issues, every one of them representing a great series of publications issued by various agencies and divisions of the Federal Government. Not all of them are about the swoose, but many of them will make as interesting reading as some of the ones I have referred to today.

Mr. President, I think there are many subjects on which our Government can properly publish information, and I am not condemning all such publications. In the field of agricultural publications, when pamphlets are issued on diseases of cotton, or the hoof-and-mouth disease, or subjects of that sort—something useful to the people of our country—such publications are commendable, and I am in favor of them. If our Government publishes a book on infant care, I think that is a fine thing. But today the Government of the United States is wasting hundreds of millions of dollars not only in printing costs but in the labor that goes into preparing and writing such books and publications—and not only in the printing and the writing of such publications, but also in the research that goes into assembling the facts in regard to how to cook muskrat meat, for instance.

Mr. President, money comes rather hard today; and in spite of the change of control in the Congress, following the elections last November, and in spite of the 4-year lease of life given to the minority administration in Washington today and its desire for big spending, someone must save some money somewhere along the line.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would not the Senator like to mention, in connection with the arguments he has just made, the scarcity of paper?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; the scarcity of paper is an important item. These different publications, between 83,000 to 84,000 in number, were published—some of them in lots running into hundreds of thousands, and some in lots of only thou-

sands—in a period when paper was extremely scarce; in fact, during that period we suffered from perhaps our greatest scarcity of paper.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNINGS] in the Chamber. I wish he had been here when I was talking about one of the recipes in a Government publication, which was entitled, "The Way To Cook Shredded Muskrat Meat à la Maryland." I did not know that Maryland specialized in that dish; but it was one of the very interesting things in the book.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator would like to have me tell him how to cook muskrat à la Maryland, I shall be very glad to tell him how to cook it; and not only that, but if he will furnish the muskrat I shall be glad to cook it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am delighted to know that. Perhaps the Senator from Maryland does not need to read the book. Under those circumstances, he can join with me in opposing the publication of the book, and in that way we can save some money.

Mr. President, I have tried to point out that Government agencies are scattered throughout our country, and are not located solely in the city of Washington, D. C. I have tried to point out that in one city—Chicago, Ill.—there are 530 separate Federal departments and agencies housed in offices there. I have tried to point out that some cities outside of Washington have as many as 25 separate Federal Government printing establishments.

I have tried to point out the ramifications of this great printing and propaganda problem in this country, and that the printing was not limited to Washington, D. C., and the Government Printing Office here, but has spread all over the United States, and even into foreign countries.

Mr. President, I have stated that from the Government Printing Office alone, here in Washington, there have rolled out, recently, 133,000,000 copies of publications and pamphlets and when we stop to think that we have 140,000,000 citizens, that is rather good coverage. In short, Mr. President, I have indicated some of the ways of presenting this matter. Of course, I have used some of the more humorous bits as examples and illustrations, because I think they typify the problem I am trying to state.

Mr. President, as I conclude my remarks, I hope this talk will not be entirely in vain, but that the Congress of the United States will make a serious attempt, as the appropriation bills come through, to limit the amount of money which the Government departments can spend for printing and binding and propaganda. It is one of the most fertile fields for Government economy the Congress of the United States can find.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While the Senator from New Hampshire is speaking of printing, I should like to mention another

subject, although perhaps it is not exactly the subject he has been discussing: I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire is familiar with the fact that the new Congressional Directory, which has just been issued, on page 313, shows, as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Mr. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, who has not yet been confirmed by the Senate, nor has his nomination been reported from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, that is very interesting; I did not know that. I now turn to page 313 of the new issue of the Congressional Directory; and it is rather startling to see Mr. Wallgren's name listed there, because I assumed that his nomination was still before the Armed Services Committee. But here is the Congressional Directory, printed by the Government of the United States, under the direction of the United States Congress; and this new issue of the Congressional Directory lists as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board a man whose nomination has not yet been reported from the Senate committee having charge of it. As a matter of fact, this book must have been printed and published some time ago; yet the nomination of that gentleman has not yet been reported to or confirmed by the Senate. Mr. President, when such a thing occurs, it must be either oversight or some kind of crystal-ball gazing. I thank the Senator from California for calling it to my attention.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to ask whether the Senator from New Hampshire has had occasion to refer to one of the first pages of the new Congressional Directory, the one opposite the page which carries the picture of the Capitol; and, after looking at that page, does the Senator from New Hampshire know to what date the new issue of the Congressional Directory is stated to have been corrected?

Mr. BRIDGES. I now refer to the page the Senator from Washington has mentioned. It says:

Eighty-first Congress, first session, beginning January 3, 1949.

Official Congressional Directory for the use of the Congress of the United States.

Then a picture of the American eagle appears, and then we find the following:

First edition, corrected to February 15, 1949.

Mr. President, today is March 9, 1949, as I recall; so apparently there is some little error even in the congressional establishment, in connection with the printing of books.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from California really believes that particular mistake in the Congressional Directory was deliberate? Actually, there are several mistakes in the Directory.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Washington I do not know how

the name got there, unless somebody put it there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Somebody, of course. As the Senator knows, proofs are made up, and is it not true many mistakes are made by the clerks? There are several mistakes in every issue, which must be corrected. The Senator of course does not believe it was deliberate, does he?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, the Senator asked a question, as I did. The matter was called to the attention of Senators. We have asked the chairman of the Committee on Printing to find out about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say in answer to the Senator, I should like to know whether he thinks the name was placed there by mistake?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a mistake at this time; of course it is; just as there are several other mistakes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question only.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator know the date on which Mr. Wallgren was nominated by the President to be the next Chairman of the National Security Resources Board?

Mr. BRIDGES. February 7, 1949.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks on the Government printing operations and Government propaganda campaign. I am sure the distinguished Vice President now occupying the chair, who is part of the administration, pledged to the reduction of expenditures, will cooperate in eliminating a good deal of the unwise propaganda pouring forth in great fountains from Washington to all parts of the country; and if he will devote his energies and attention to the subject, based upon my knowledge of him and of his performance in the past, I feel sure we shall have great assistance in achieving the objective we seek.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thanks the Senator from New Hampshire for his generous compliment.

#### AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 15, amending the so-called cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Douglas	Hendrickson
Baldwin	Downey	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Eastland	Hill
Bricker	Eaton	Hoey
Bridges	Ellender	Holland
Butler	Ferguson	Hunt
Byrd	Flanders	Ives
Cain	Frear	Jenner
Capehart	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Chapman	George	Johnson, Tex.
Chavez	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Connally	Green	Kefauver
Cordon	Gurney	Kerr
Donnell	Hayden	

Kilgore	Miller	Stennis
Knowland	Millikin	Taft
Langer	Morse	Taylor
Lodge	Mundt	Thomas, Okla.
Long	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Lucas	Myers	Thye
McCarran	Neely	Tobey
McCarthy	O'Connor	Tydings
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
McFarland	Pepper	Watkins
McGrath	Reed	Wherry
McKellar	Robertson	Wiley
McMahon	Russell	Williams
Magnuson	Saltonstall	Withers
Malone	Schoeppel	Young
Martin	Smith, Maine	
Maybank	Sparkman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in view of the very strict enforcement of the rules of the Senate I withhold at present the making of a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding is that the pending question is on the motion to take up consideration of Senate Resolution 15. That resolution, Mr. President, has for its purpose a change in a rule of the United States Senate which gives protection to a minority of the membership of this body, and often, in doing so, it gives protection to a majority of the citizenship of this Nation. A simple change in the rule is not all that is involved in this issue. It has many ramifications of great significance, and it has the possibilities of tragic consequences. What is involved in this matter is an inexhaustible subject. I do not presume that in the time I shall occupy the floor this afternoon I shall be able to say all that I might say upon the subject or to discuss at length all of its ramifications. The subject, Mr. President, could easily exhaust me and consume the full measure of my physical strength and mental vitality long before I could exhaust the discussion of the subject, assuming that I had the wisdom to discuss all phases of it.

So, Mr. President, I shall not undertake to exert myself and expend my strength hastily; but if I proceed with some deliberation I want to assure the President of the Senate and my colleagues that that is no indication or evidence of lack of sincerity or of enthusiasm or of conviction with respect to the position that I shall take.

Mr. President, in contemplating this occasion the scene which we now witness in this Chamber and which we have witnessed for the past 10 or 15 days—the threat that the Senate would lay aside important business and important affairs to take up what I knew, and what every other Member of this body knew, would be one of the most controversial subjects that has come before this body in the last quarter of a century, or possibly longer. I realized this, Mr. President, from the history of past debates on subjects and issues which involved very much the same questions and problems which are involved in this debate. Knowing the action taken in the past, the long debates which have ensued, knowing also, Mr. President, there was possibly great pressure being applied from minority groups and from others who would like to impose this iniquitous thing upon the American people, knowing that the pressure at this time and on this occasion would be more intense and

concerted not only against the Senate of the United States but against the President of the United States himself and against this administration, there would possibly arise, and I think there has arisen, a desire on the part of the majority leadership of the Senate and others to make this an ordeal, an endurance test, a test of strength and capacity. Yes, Mr. President; it is a physical ordeal. It carries with it some anxiety, and particularly when we realize the merits involved, because we would lay aside in this time of world history great and important questions when there is more trouble, more distress, more chaos, more threat to human rights than ever before in the history of the world, except possibly when war was actually in progress.

Contemplating that, Mr. President, I found myself wishing that there might be some way, that something might transpire to cause the leadership of this body and others who were willing to compel consideration of this motion not to do so. As I thought about it the other evening, before the motion was made, after I had retired and these perplexing thoughts came to my mind as to why this was necessary, why we must suffer this ordeal, I found myself uttering a prayer in words almost in exact quotation of the prayer that Jesus offered up in the Garden of Gethsemane. Not only did I hope that the Senate of the United States might be spared this unnecessary, this useless, trouble, this conflict, because I not only wanted to be spared myself, but I thought of my fellow Senators. But, Mr. President, if I prayed more intensely about one thing than another it was that there still were enough of us left here who thought more of our country, who loved our liberty more, and who loved it sufficiently to have the strength to stand and oppose this movement until that strength was exhausted.

I hoped and prayed above all that the majority in this body and the leadership of this body would not press that cup to the lips of the American people and make them drink those bitter, those destructive drugs that are contained in this proposal. I urge Senators to think well of what they do.

Mr. President, I hope that this cup may soon pass from the Senate, and I hope it will never again be pressed to the lips of the free men and women of America.

Mr. President, I do not know whether reading from the Bible would be a breach of the rules of the Senate, it is getting pretty hard to tell what the rules are right now, but I thought I might read just a little Scripture. I am sure every Senator here is already informed, but when I turned to this Scripture the other night and read where Jesus prayed that that cup might pass from Him, I could not help following on and reading a little further, and recalling again what history has recorded as to what transpired immediately thereafter.

Mr. President, we are hearing much about majority rule. We are hearing much about breaking precedents. We are hearing something around here about the precedents of the Senate being overruled for the sake of expediency. I recall

that our Saviour who prayed that the cup might pass from Him was soon to be condemned by a mob, by the majority, by majority rule. Then, Mr. President, I remembered, as I read the Scripture again, that the Saviour of man was condemned by the overruling of precedents, in that Pontius Pilate, the governor, could find no fault with him, and it was not the practice, and it is not the rule, to condemn to death innocent men. But precedent was broken in order to serve the will of a majority, a howling mob.

Mr. President, back in the shadows behind the Senate there are howling mobs which insist that Senators forget their oaths, forget their consciences, forget their duty, and be subservient to the will of the mob, even if it takes the overruling of the precedents of the United States Senate. That is what Senators are being asked to do, that is what Pontius Pilate was asked to do, and he did it, and the Saviour of mankind was crucified.

Yes, I know what he did, in a back-door sort of fashion. He sent and got a bowl of water and washed his hands and said, "I am going to have nothing to do with this good man," and tried to get the mob, on that occasion, as was the practice, to let him release the Saviour, but they would not do that, they took Barabbas instead.

You are taking Barabbas instead when you condemn these traditions which have made America great, when you overrule the precedents and the rules of the United States Senate which made it possible for minorities to be protected in the past. You are asking the release of the other, and subjecting to crucifixion, if the majority can have its way in the United States Senate at this time, one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty which the American people have.

Mr. President, the Senate was not intended to be just another legislative body. The very construction of it, the way it was set up, the very conception of it in the hearts and minds of our founding fathers, made the United States Senate something distinct, separate, apart, unto itself, as a legislative body. It has been kept that way until now. It ought to be so retained. Yes, Pilate washed his hands in an endeavor to see to it that the blood of the Saviour be not upon him. I am not going to wash my hands. I am going to vote against, speak against, and so long as I have the strength and the rational mind necessary, oppose what the Senate now proposes to do.

Mr. President, in political campaigns it is the practice, and quite proper, to exhort all good men to come to the aid of their party. I suppose most all political parties do that, particularly when a campaign is on, and we see, even when a campaign is not on, that cartoonists sometimes depict the minds of leaders in government and others, by giving illustration in comedy, in the nature of cartoons. Just this week, on March 7, one of the leading newspapers in Washington contained a cartoon on the first page showing the chairman of the Democratic National Committee pounding away on his typewriter, exhorting: "Now is the time for all good men of the North, East, and West to come to the aid of their party."

Of course, the cartoonist was simply being facetious. But, Mr. President, in times of national emergency, in times of danger of peril to our country, or when there is threat of evil legislation, we need to exhort all good men to come to the aid of their country.

Mr. President, I have never known how to be anything else politically but a Democrat. Democracy, as Southern Democrats know it, and have lived it and loved it, has been instilled into me from infancy. I shall never forget when I was only 8 years old attending a little summer country school. I had a little difficulty with another student, and the teacher, in order to enforce better discipline, and not being quite certain who was at fault, made sure he punished the right one by punishing both of us. I am not quite so certain I was not the right one, but according to the way I reported the incident to my father I probably deserved a medal rather than a thrashing.

It developed that the school teacher was a Republican. There were not many Republicans in that part of the country. He was the only one I can remember at that age. So my father, being such a partisan Democrat, thought it very appropriate that we even the score with this Republican school teacher, and in accordance with custom, some two or three weeks later when the school closed, and when we had the little exercises wherein the students might recite, "Twinkle, twinkle little star," or some other little poem or verse to display their oratorical abilities, instead of my memorizing some little verse, my father had prepared for me a speech supporting the nomination of Alton B. Parker. So Senators may understand that I am a Democrat from the beginning until now.

But, Mr. President, that is not the greatest thing of which to boast. However much more merit the Democratic Party may have, or however superior the Democratic Party may be to other political parties, or vice versa, that is not the issue.

What I am trying to emphasize is that it does not matter today, when it comes to the question at issue, whether one is a Republican or Democrat. The issue before us transcends party alignments. It transcends party obligations. Being a member of a political party, according to my concept of duty and conscience, imposes no obligation upon me to follow the leadership of that party, if and when the leadership of the party proposes legislation or policies which contravene or threaten or endanger the fundamental liberties of our land.

No, Mr. President, no Member of this body is under any such obligation, and took no such oath of allegiance, but he did take an oath of a higher allegiance than party allegiance when he became a Member of the United States Senate.

So I say, Mr. President, that the issue before us is one—and we sometimes hear it facetiously said—upon which we ought to rise above principle, and I mean party principle. We ought to rise to the height of American dignity, and everything Americanism stands for, and everything that is guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land.

I heard the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] speak on this subject a few days ago. He warned Senators that our Constitutional guarantees could be whittled away little by little. Very few countries have lost their liberties through one bold stroke of legislation. Most countries who have lost their liberties have lost them by a softening process, by the temptation to and a response of yielding to a little demand here and a little more there, and on and on. If America ever falters, if America ever fails, the America that you and I know, in view of our almost matchless power and strength economically and as a military power, will more likely fail by reason of disintegration from within. Disintegration can be brought about, and it is possible for disintegration to come in America, by the whittling down process of which the very able senior Senator from Georgia spoke a few days ago.

Mr. President, speaking of all good men coming to the aid of their country, that is important when this great deliberative body, the United States Senate, is urged to enact laws which are inimical to the welfare of our people, and which contravene the very concept of our liberties. On such occasions it is the duty and obligation of every Member of this body to rise above partisanship and above political considerations, and thus come to the aid and protection of our country.

Mr. President, is there one among us, is there a single Member of the United States Senate, who will refute the charge, and undertake to sustain the refutation of it, that except for political pressure groups this proposal would not be before the Senate today? Instead of wasting its time the Senate, in whose integrity and wisdom of action the very safety of America is reposed, could be undertaking to legislate on constructive measures which might bring more order, more peace, and more harmony among our people, and strengthen our economy. The time and energies of Members of this body, possibly for a period of weeks, is being consumed by an effort to impose upon the American people an iniquitous program, one which would stir up more strife, more disunity, and one which has less to recommend it to the conscience of honest men than any program that has ever been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. President, if we are going to yield to pressure groups, America cannot survive. When men write to Members of Congress and insist that they do their will without thinking, and undertake to coerce and intimidate by threatening to defeat them at the polls in the next election, if that philosophy, that sort of coercion and intimidation, is substituted for rational thinking and sound judgment on the part of Members of the Congress, the doom of America and of American liberty and freedom is somewhere in the offing.

But it is said that this is a democracy, and that the people vote, and that we ought to carry out their will. I do not know about that. When that will may have been expressed without full knowledge and information, or whenever that will contravenes the fundamental law of

the land, no one is under obligation to carry it out.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator not agree with me that the so-called FEPC bill is one of the main bills behind the move to change the rules of the Senate and impose gag rule in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct in part. That is the main one which appears on the surface. A while ago I spoke of the mob back in the shadows. That is not the final objective of their program. If we pass the bills now pending in the Senate, the next measure, and the final objective, will be to break down the segregation of the races. Make no mistake about it. We could not compromise with the gang which is behind the proposed legislation and pressing for its passage, threatening Members of Congress with defeat in the next election if they do not pass it. We could not settle with them on the present program.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Arkansas familiar with the fact that the so-called FEPC bill, in a State version, has been submitted to the people of 15 States, and that every time it has been submitted to the people for their vote it has been voted down by overwhelming majorities? Is it not true that the question was recently submitted to the people of the State of California, and that the people of the State of California voted it down overwhelmingly, by a vote of more than 3 to 1? Does the Senator know that the people of California defeated it overwhelmingly in every county in the entire State?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not checked that information, but I believe I have heard it stated on the floor of the Senate that that is what occurred in California recently. I have not counted the number of times the question has been submitted, but I do know that from time to time when the question of an FEPC under State law has been submitted to the people, it has been defeated. I do not recall a single State where such a proposal has been submitted, where the people approved it. All States are represented in the Senate by two Senators. If there is a single State in the Union where the people have approved such a law when the question was submitted to them, surely some Senator supporting this legislation would rise and cite evidence of the will of the people in any State where such a law might have been approved by the people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not yield further at the moment.

That is why the supporters of this program want the Congress to disregard the Constitution and everything it stands for, because they know that they cannot

carry out their abominable will by going directly to the people of the States. Would not that be a fair way to do it? No one would object to that method.

If the people of New York want to have an FEPC there, or if the people of Montana or the people of Wyoming or the people of Pennsylvania or the people of Texas or the people of Kalamazoo or the people of any other section of our country want an FEPC law, they can have it, Mr. President; in such a case the Congress could not legally interfere with it. The only way they could be prevented from having it would be for Congress to submit and the States to ratify a constitutional amendment prohibiting the enactment of such a law; but, of course, everyone knows such a proposal would not get anywhere.

However, some persons want to reverse the situation, inasmuch as the people in the several States where such an FEPC proposal has been submitted have condemned it and rejected it, an attempt now is made to resort to the Congress and have the Congress violate the Constitution in order to get that infamous proposal adopted.

Now I shall be glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he read the portion I shall mention of the hearings on the proposal to limit debate in the Senate of the United States; and I read now from pages 132 and 133, where the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] made this statement with reference to the FEPC bill:

For instance, I will take the State of California. There it—

#### Meaning the FEPC—

has been submitted to a vote of the people, as I recall, and every time it has been submitted to the people it has been overwhelmingly defeated. It was overwhelmingly defeated in California, as I remember, by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

Is that accurate?

To that question the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] answered:

It was overwhelmingly defeated.

Then the following occurred:

Senator EASTLAND. In every county?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana ask me if I read that?

Mr. LONG. Yes; did the Senator from Arkansas read it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not present at that time, and I did not hear the Senator testify. But I did read the testimony given by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not yield further at the moment.

Mr. President, I have been discussing the question of rising above party, and going to the aid of our country. This is equally true when we are confronted with requests for the enactment of measures which, if enacted, would usurp the powers that are reserved unto the several States of the Union and unto the people themselves.

I have just said there is no doubt that the Constitution reserves to the States themselves the power to do everything that is requested in connection with these proposals, except the power to set up a Federal police power over lynching. Otherwise, all such powers are reserved to the States themselves. When the Constitution is rightfully interpreted, it is found that such powers are not granted the Federal Government, and never have been, because all the powers of the Federal Government are derived from the people themselves, and only the powers that are delegated to the Federal Government can be exercised by the Federal Government. All other powers—in this connection I shall not take time to read the provisions of the tenth amendment to the Constitution, for all Senators are familiar with it—are reserved to the States and to the people themselves.

Mr. President, it is not disputed that the States themselves have the right to adopt the proposals which presently are made to us. That is the important point to be remembered in connection with the present proposals and the contentions regarding them. If the people of any State believe in these proposed laws and wish to have them, they can have them so far as we are concerned; just let the people back home approve these proposals and adopt them. It is easy to have them adopted, if that is the people's will. But if it is merely some pressure group that is making such demands, that is different.

Mr. President, I make no claim to perfection. All of us are beset with some human frailties. But if there were ever a period in the history of our Republic when the highest quality of intellect, wisdom, and integrity were needed by the Members of this body, that time is now. Our country needs our best, because there is a threat to our liberties. There is danger to our traditions and to many of our basic freedoms. Our concepts and ideals of freedom are under attack. A cold war, a global war, is now in progress. This war is an unrelenting war. There is no prospect that it will end or can be terminated within the foreseeable future. I do not know how long it will last, but I see no prospect of having it end now or at any time soon.

This cold war may grow in intensity. Not only does the cold war that now is in progress strike at governments and nations, but it actually imperils civilization. Smaller and weaker nations, unable to resist, have been helpless and defenseless, and have been compelled to capitulate to the forces of tyranny and conquest, to that powerful monster, communism, which is now abroad in the world seeking to devour and to destroy every vestige of freedom, wherever it may exist. At the moment, the direct thrust may not extend to America, but the indirect thrust is present here. This monster intends to destroy human liberty everywhere in the world. All concepts of freedom, wherever they exist in the world today, are under attack. In many parts of the world, where battles in this cold war are now being fought, we find the forces of religious freedom being persecuted and the rights of the indi-

vidual and his freedom of mind and of thought and of action restrained and controlled by the state.

Mr. President, is there religious persecution in our land? None of these measures is designed to prohibit any religious persecution in our country. Of course we have none. Some persons say that religion and ancestry and color and race are taken into consideration when a person seeks a job. But, actually, all that has nothing to do with a man's religion and his right of freedom of worship. That goes beyond religion, and goes into the question of whether one man has a right to share with another individual what he himself has created. I shall have more to say about that matter before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, what I have just mentioned is not a matter of religious freedom. A man can have all the religious freedom on earth he wants, but never be employed by me or by some other Senator or by anyone else.

In the newspapers of this morning we read of the sentences which have been imposed on ministers of the Protestant faith in a foreign land, ministers who it is said have committed no crime whatsoever. Recently we learned of the Catholic priest who was condemned to life imprisonment in a foreign country.

Yes, Mr. President, the menace of which I speak intends, if it has the power to do it—and let us make no mistake about that—to spread its ideology throughout the world; and its ideology is human slavery. We are aware, or at least we should be, that this monster is presently employing and pursuing every means short of a shooting war, while actually preparing for a third world war, which it boldly proclaims is inevitable, to beguile, deceive, soften, and cripple our own people and our own Government and all civilization for the final kill.

Follow me as I lead up to this point. I am not mistaken about it. This power has decreed that our capitalistic economy, our free-enterprise system, and our way of life and the dignity of man as an individual must be exterminated from the face of the earth.

Are we so blind that we will not see; so deaf that we will not hear? Are we incapable of reading the signs of our time? Or seeing, do we refuse to read? Or reading, do we give those signs their proper interpretation and acknowledge their significance?

Our complacency and lack of diligence, if not our actual stupidity within the last quarter of a century, brought us into two world wars unprepared. We were well warned beforehand. There were many unmistakable signs in concrete events that transpired, from which we could have known that our becoming involved in those wars was inescapable. But we refused to interpret correctly those events. We did not heed the warnings in those prewar days, and our neglect to make ready for those contests exacted a much heavier cost in material wealth, human lives, and suffering as the price for winning those military victories. Have the blood, sweat, and tears we expended for survival in those mighty conflicts instilled into us no greater wisdom,

no keener sense of danger, no better understanding of the tactics and insidious softening processes employed by the developing aggressor? Have we learned nothing from those tragic experiences of the recent past? If we have not, Mr. President, then I fear we at present are living in a fool's paradise. If we have learned any lesson, Mr. President, from two world wars from which we were unable to escape, then certainly we should make use of that knowledge and employ the experience and wisdom gained to build a stronger fortress of Government and citadel of freedom over here.

Mr. President, the aggressor—and we know who that aggressor is in the world today—will not attack in a shooting war until it believes it has the superior power and strength to conquer. But once it becomes so convinced, the world will again be plunged into a holocaust of brimstone and fire.

Your country and mine, Mr. President, is the hope of the world today. The United States of America enjoys the honor and the enviable position of being the only present insurmountable barrier to a world Communist superstate and the literal enslavement of the human race. Were it not for our might and power the sovereignty of many nations, smaller and weaker than are we, would have long since perished.

What made our country great and powerful, Mr. President? I acknowledge there are many answers to that question. The answer in fact cannot be given in a single word, in a sentence, in a chapter, or in a single book. Volumes would be required to tell the whole story. But, Mr. President, we can name in one word the thing that is inimical to everything that has made America great. That one word is communism. If there was ever a government in its concept and in its principles and in its fundamentals that was further away from communism, that government, the one furthest away in the history of the world, is the United States of America.

This greatness is the priceless heritage of our generation. And Mr. President, that heritage is now entrusted to you and to me as the elected representatives of the people of the several States in the United States Senate. If we falter through lack of wisdom, or if through political pressure today we yield to unwise demands, and pass unwholesome laws, laws that do not come within the letter and spirit of the Constitution, which is the fundamental law of our land—if we do that, Mr. President, we shall be poor guardians, we shall exercise a sordid trusteeship of the great heritage we are expected to preserve and hand down to posterity.

We are the trustees, the guardians of this great citadel of strength and freedom, and millions of people throughout the world are the direct beneficiaries of the might and power embraced in the greatness of our country.

What are we doing today to help the world, and particularly the war-torn countries that were devastated by the war? What are we doing out of our greatness and a heart that is as human as the power and economic might of the

United States is great? Out of that we are taxing our people to help the unfortunate peoples of the earth. If America had not had the kind of liberty we have had for the past 175 years, do you think, Mr. President, we would be in a position today to extend this helping hand to the other governments and nations and peoples of the world? I say no, we would not be. I ask you to show me a nation with any other kind of government—and we are comparatively the youngest of all—show me a nation with any other kind of government, Mr. President, any other kind of ism that is inimical to democracy as we know it and practice it and believe in it. Where is that government, with the power and strength to help? Yes, other governments, millions of other human beings, are still alive today because America has the economic power developed and established and maintained under a free-enterprise system under which we prize human liberty and the rights of the individual and the dignity of man, Mr. President, above those who have authority to rule.

Yes, Mr. President, if this strength and power are to be preserved, maintained, and increased, so that they may be forever the insurmountable barrier they are today to the evil forces of tyranny, aggression, and conquest, we must not permit any weakening of the basic structure upon which they rest.

Mr. President, I would ask the question here, Will any Senator dare rise in this body and assert that America is weaker today, economically, spiritually, or otherwise, because this proposed change in the rule was not adopted a hundred years ago or at some other time in the history of our Nation? Of course, a Senator would not dare to do so, Mr. President. It is absurd. Why insist upon a change at this time? The country is doing very well. We have our problems, but they consist in what we are doing to ourselves more than in what another nation is doing to us. If we keep America on the beam and keep the Constitution of the United States as our forefathers framed it, we shall not have much trouble.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to him?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator, if he prefers not to be interrupted at this stage in his very able discussion, please to say so, because I can defer my question until later if he prefers that that be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, to yield for questions. I will say that it would be impossible for me, even if I had the physical strength to do so, to conclude within any reasonable time all that I might say on this subject. I am perfectly willing to yield to a reasonable extent to my colleagues for pertinent questions. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arkansas if one of the essential elements of the strength of the American system of free enterprise is not the right to own private property?

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I answer that question by saying it is, and by saying that every individual in America who owns any property is a part of the capitalistic system of this Nation. A man who owns a little home, even though it be a humble cottage, has the right to own it, under the laws of the land. He owns it in his own right, without interference from Government, without the right of the Government to take it and use it. The Government can take property in this capitalistic land of ours, only for public use and only by paying just compensation for it, so that the property owner sustains no loss.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question, if he will yield further.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not true that one of the most insidious forms of the attacks of communism, which the Senator has aptly described as the very antithesis of the republican form of government, is the attack being made upon the right of ownership of private property?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if we can escape state socialism if we permit an entering wedge to be driven by the Government or any agency of the Government or the representatives of any minority group and they are given the right to say to any man who owns a plant or a store whom he shall employ? Is not that pure state socialism, which will result in the Government taking over and owning private property and thereby destroying our free system of competitive enterprise?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, when I was quite a young lad, I often went with my grandfather to cut down selected white-oak trees, from which we took the sap so that my grandfather could make splints and weave baskets. We cut down hickory trees in order to make mauls and ax handles. When a man cuts down a tree and converts that natural resource into a tool of usefulness, who would dare say that tool does not belong to him? If I had the genius and the talent to sit at this desk or in my office and write a poem or a song that would touch the hearts and move the souls of men, whose property would that poem be if I cared to have it copyrighted? If, through my ingenuity, I invent an instrumentality that can lighten the burden of mankind or be of service to humanity, if I care to have it patented, I have a property right in it which is mine, and my Government so recognizes. Then, Mr. President, if a man creates a job by investing money which he has earned and saved, it belongs to him. He invests his money in a business. He takes the risk. He has an incentive to go into business to make a profit. Whether it be a little corner grocery store or some great enterprise which spread from coast to coast across this continent, if he creates it, it is his. The Government did not create it. When we want the Government to create jobs, and the individual not to create them, that is socialism. Whenever the Government takes control, it is nothing but

bureaucracy, under which the Government would tell us where to work and what pay we should receive. Do we want that in America? Those are the things that did not make America great. We can sometimes tell what produced a result by knowing what did not produce it. A job which I have created by my own ingenuity, my own capital, my own toil, labor, and thrift does not belong to any bureaucrat, in any democracy, among any free people on earth, to dispense to whomever the Government chooses. It belongs to me, so long as America is free. If it were otherwise, it would be another instance of the whittling-away process. That is exactly what it would be.

Mr. President, we cannot permit any weakening of the basic structure upon which the Government rests. We cannot preserve, and persevere in, this strength and power if we ever begin compromising with the ideology which Russia is now trying to impose upon the rest of the world. We cannot compromise with Russia. That is thoroughly demonstrated. Its goal, its objectives, its ideology permit of no compromise. I say permit of none; they might make an agreement temporarily, but who would have any faith in it?

Under the present leadership of Russia and under the ideology of communism as practiced today, I do not think we can take her word for anything. I think we will be foolish if we ever do. I think we had better make her understand our words, we had better stay prepared and keep our freedoms and keep strong, and shun the very appearance of communism in this country. I remember some more of the Bible; I do not know too much about it, not nearly enough, but I think it teaches us to shun the very appearance of evil. We had better shun anything that begins to smack of communistic doctrines in this country.

We hear so much about making democracy work and making democracy live. So often many who claim to have that high purpose insist that to do so we must depart from and abandon many of the basic fundamentals which have served so effectively in the past in the building of our greatness, and accept, instead, and to degrees, parts of the Communist philosophy of politics, society, and economy.

Why do we have to partake of any part of it? We hear commentators and others say, "Well, if you do not want communism over here, you have to do a lot of the things Communists are doing." That makes sense to a fool, and to no one else.

We do not cause something to live by pouring poison on it or putting a destructive substance on it. If we want it to live we feed it the blood of life, that which goes into making it what it is, and we do not make it live by taking away from it. Every part and parcel of communism we adopt in America in this year or the next year or the next will simply take away that much of the real Americanism that has made America what she is.

Such arguments portend a dangerous indoctrination. If our people should ever become so careless or indifferent, or

should be so gullible and stupid, as to accept or follow such illogical and dangerous leadership, our strength and power will degenerate accordingly. We cannot partake of communism, or accept any part or parcel of its philosophy and ideology, without weakening our own fortress of liberty.

To the extent that we pattern our laws after the socialistic theory and communistic practices we will place in jeopardy the freedom we love. To whatever degree we depart from or abandon the fundamentals of our own system of government, which by comparison and by time and test has proven to be superior to any other form or system of government ever instituted by man, to the same extent will the fiber and vitality of our own Government, and of the way of life it protects and preserves, deteriorate and decay.

If we want to soften America for the kill when the next war comes, if one shall come, there is no better way to do it than to begin now compromising with communism, and begin patterning our laws after those of Soviet Russia.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. What could set the pattern of communism to take over the United States more than the undermining of the powers of our State governments, depriving the American people of the very genius of the American system, which is local control of their affairs and local protection of their affairs, concentrating all power in the National Government, as the proposals we are discussing seek to do?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If ever State rights are abrogated in America, there will be no restraining power in the world to prevent a dictator from taking over in this country. Destroy State rights, and once they are destroyed, the people within the States will lose the power of control.

Hitler had his fifth columns in many lands and in many governments for a long period of time before he began World War II. Those fifth columns served well in preparing the way for success of war against the countries wherein those columns stood. It was a softening process by corruption in the high places and by propaganda that deceived and deluded the minds and hearts of people, and which had its telling effect upon the political integrity of governments themselves. Thus, many countries were weakened and their conquest made certain and easy.

Mr. President, if the Communist powers or power can get Americans to believe that the way to get along with them is to pattern after their laws and their ideologies, Americans will be placing themselves in a position of danger and jeopardy from which they would be unable to extricate themselves if and when such a war should come.

Mr. President, similar evil forces are present in America today. We need not think that all the influence of communism and all the activity of communism

and all the subversiveness and all the cold war exists only in Europe or in Asia or somewhere else. These forces are present in America today. We are reassured over and over that the number of real Communists in America today is small. In fact, we are told the number is so small that we need not be concerned, and that their power and capacity for harm, either in time of peace or in time of war, would be infinitesimal. But I am not so certain that such statements or such attempted assurances are at all justified, if the whole truth were known. It occurs to me that they possibly have larger numbers and are of greater potential danger than we are willing to concede. But, irrespective of the number of real Communists in America, whether that number is small or much larger than we think, it is bold and threatening.

Mr. President, I only have to refer the Senate, as I shall in a little while, to headlines and newspaper articles which appeared only a few days ago, since the present debate has been going on in the Senate, to show the danger that exists.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the argument that has been made by some persons that it would help us in curtailing the activities of Communists and subversive interests if we would change the rules of the United States Senate so as to install gag law here on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall comment on that as I proceed a little further. I can give my opinion about it, and tell the Senator who will rejoice when such a thing happens. It will not be the God-fearing and God-loving people of America, who love their country and want to preserve it—those who know what the real results of such action would be.

In the course of the present debate, since the motion to take up the resolution has been pending, the Communists in America, through their leaders, have brazenly announced in no uncertain terms that if war should come they will aid our enemies, they will fight on the side of the aggressor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that so far as the Communists are concerned, the Communists have made their position known on this gag-rule proposition to the effect that the Communists want gag rule in the United States Senate, and the Communists want the same kind of FEPC law, for example, that is proposed to be passed by gag rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Communists do not want freedom of speech anywhere in the world, and they do not tolerate it. I think everyone knows that to be so. It would be just a step in that direction if this body should take the action we are now asked to take, after all our tradi-

tions of the past, and when no one can point to any real harm which has ever come from unlimited debate in the United States Senate. There may be temporary delay, but no real harm has ever come to the American people by maintaining this sanctuary of freedom of speech. I hope it will never be destroyed. I do not want to see our freedom taken away or see our country begin to abandon them.

Mr. President, I said the Communists were bold and brazen and threatening. A short time ago certain articles appeared in all the newspapers of the land dealing with what the Communists in this country had announced. I hold in my hand the Times-Herald of Washington, dated March 3, published since the present debate began. The headline is: "United States Commies join French Reds' threat to aid Soviet in war."

I shall not take the time to read all the news article. It says that the two leading Communists in America, the official representatives of communism in America, William Z. Foster and the general secretary, Eugene Dennis, said that American Communists would oppose such a war "as an unjust, aggressive, imperialist war."

They do not say they would oppose it if Russia started it. They do not say they would oppose such a war if it was provoked by aggression from Russia. There can be but one implication in that statement, and that implication is that if war comes they will oppose it. I suspect without war coming, so long as there is ever a possibility that there may be a war between Communist Russia and America, every Communist in the United States is a potential at least, if not an active, spy for Russia.

Some of them may be so simple they do not know what they are doing. We have had some testimony to that effect. One man was consorting with a known Communist. He carried papers to this Communist in secret. He delivered the papers to him. He pleaded his ignorance, or his youth, or something else. That could be true. The point I make is that every Communist in America, the little ones, the big ones, the middle-sized ones, the yellow ones, the striped ones, the spotted ones, the pink ones, the red ones, or those of any other color or term which can be applied to them—every one of them is an enemy of this country. They are enemies of everything you and I love. They are enemies of every vestige of freedom we enjoy, because we would not enjoy any if we had communism here. Every one of them that is physically able and well enough is a potential soldier, an enemy soldier, if and when war comes.

One may talk about tolerating them, temporizing with them, compromising with them; but they do not deserve the respect of the toleration of those of us who love our freedom and who intend, if we can, at all costs to maintain and preserve it.

Those who are not able to carry arms, when that war comes will definitely be engaged in sabotage, and from now until war comes they are engaged, so far as they can go and get by with it, in subversive activities.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the figures which have been released on occasion that it is estimated the Communists have 70,000 members in the United States, and that they have 700,000 fellow travelers who would do the bidding of the 70,000 Communists?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think anyone knows the number.

We all know the characteristics of communism. Communists will lie about anything. The truth is not in them. They must have a few known members; but there are many who have accepted the faith and who give their allegiance to Russia, though they are American citizens. They are undertaking to keep the truth concealed. Many of them are today advocating and encouraging many of the things which are being done.

A little while ago the very able Senator from Georgia asked me about property rights. Under the guise of liberalism and human rights versus property rights, great harm is being done in America today. Whenever we destroy property rights, there are no human rights, except as some dictator may permit. We cannot have human rights without property rights. Wherever in the history of the world property rights have been taken by the state, human rights of the individual have perished. If we cannot maintain and preserve property rights in our capitalistic system in America, we cannot retain that measure of freedom, that dignity of the individual, which Americans have today.

And what is transpiring in the United States today and what has been the business of the Senate for the past 10 days is a fair sample, Mr. President, of just what I mean. There is not a Communist in America who is not happy and pleased. There is not an informed Communist in Russia or within the jurisdiction of the Cominform who is not elated at the prospects of the passage of the resolution that has been moved for consideration in this body.

I would not say that many persons who are supporting this resolution, or who might support it or favor it, are not just as good Americans as I am; but I think they are mistaken when they believe that they are serving America. I know that if we were doing something which tended to strengthen America, tended to make her stronger and not weaker, something which represented another safeguard of our liberties and our freedoms, that would not please the Communists.

Every Communist in America, if he follows the party line, would vote to curtail and limit debate in the United States Senate. There is no freedom of debate in Russia. Every Communist in America, and throughout the world, in my opinion, will applaud every vote for this resolution. But while applauding, in my opinion, they will be laughing at those who so easily but terribly blundered.

Mr. President, the reasoning which brings us to conclusions and final judgment with respect to our actions in this

body as Members of the United States Senate can be subjected to many tests. One rather safe test, I think, we, as Members of the Senate, can make as we consider measures in this body and that is, Does the measure have Communist support? There might be some exceptions, but as a general rule measures which have the support of Communists in America are measures which, if enacted, would harm our country and serve to advance the cause of communism. Therefore, when the Communists in this country express an opinion on policies of our Government, upon proposed laws or programs, this should serve as a warning to make us more cautious, to cause us to stop, look, and listen before we proceed to do that which would give them any comfort or cause for the slightest gratification.

Mr. President, when I vote—if I have that opportunity—to prevent consideration of Senate Resolution 15, to change the rules of the United States Senate, or when I vote against cloture on the pending motion, or on the resolution itself, I shall not please the Communists in America or the Communists abroad.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that in view of some things I have been hearing today, and in view of circumstances beyond my control, I may not have the opportunity to vote, whichever way the test comes in this body on that issue; but if I have the opportunity to vote to prevent consideration of Senate Resolution 15 or to vote against cloture on the pending motion or on the resolution itself, I shall not please the Communists. They will not applaud my vote; they will get no aid or comfort from my decision and action. But the American people can get comfort and gratification from my vote, and they will. Those who love America, who love their freedom, who cherish religious liberty and freedom of speech and freedom of mind and freedom of conscience, and who want to preserve these and hand them on to posterity—they can applaud those of us who vote here to prevent this evil thing from being done.

Mr. President, the American people are becoming a little impatient about the inaction of the Federal Government in dealing with Communists in this country. I am not prepared at the moment to say what legislation is required or just what action is needed; but a few days ago, while this debate has been in progress, I received a letter from a citizen in my State, a man who is chairman of the Americanism committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Arkansas. I was very much impressed by it. I can well understand why any American citizen might express the same views that are expressed by this citizen of my State, who represents the boys who went across and actually did the fighting to win the great military conflict which threatened the Christian civilization of the world.

I am persuaded that there are many who wonder if the Congress will rise to the occasion and meet these issues, irrespective of small political groups and pressure gangs who try to threaten us. Mr. President, I would rather cast one vote in the United States Senate and be

expelled from it than to be elected for a thousand years and have to do the bidding of the Communists in this country.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Now is the time for all good red-blooded Americans to demand the outlawing of the Communist Party within this United States of America.

Mr. President, I do not know whether I have already said that that is exactly the best procedure; but the American people want something done about that situation. What are we doing here? We are doing just the opposite. What is being undertaken to be done in the Senate will, if it succeeds, furnish much gratification and joy to the Communists, for then they will have one more place where restrictions will have been placed on freedom of speech. The United States is where they want that done. If they can ever prevent freedom of speech in the Senate of the United States, they will be just that much closer to preventing freedom of speech among all the people of the United States, and they will be that much closer to destroying religious freedom and the other freedoms we cherish.

I read further from the letter:

The leaders of this murderous, traitorous, destructive and double-crossing, slave-driving, and libelous movement, have plainly declared their intentions toward our United States of America in case of war with our common enemy—Russia.

Mr. President, that is what I referred to a while ago, when I held up the headlines of a recent issue of a Washington newspaper. The American people are conscious of this danger, even if the Senate of the United States is not. The American people know it is time for action. But the kind of action that is being attempted to be taken here in the Senate is not the kind of action the people want, and it is not the kind of action that is necessary to protect the people and to preserve for them what they cherish and love and what their sons died for across the seas in two world wars.

The writer of the letter continues, as follows:

No case will ever be more clear. This is a dire threat that shall not go unanswered.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

You know now they definitely intend sabotage, destruction, pollution, and hindrance to the fullest extent of their power if war should come between our great Nation and this common enemy—Russia.

Mr. President, this letter comes from a former serviceman, a veteran who represents thousands of veterans in my State; and I know that thousands of veterans elsewhere in America share the same views he expresses in this letter.

I read further from the letter:

It is high time that this enemy in our very midst be openly recognized as such and necessary legislation be passed to outlaw and control this national menace. To outlaw an international gangster is the natural thing to do—we do not permit the individual gangster to run rampant in our communities. If the Communists go underground, let them go; you can catch a mole, and we have the means to do that little thing. To

permit them to walk our public streets unmolested and have the use of our public halls is inviting national suicide. And we know you do not favor this.

Mr. President, the program of communism is the overthrow of our Government and all other governments by conquest, by force, if necessary. I think any American citizen who subscribes to that doctrine is a traitor to his country; and if any of our citizens commit any overt act in that direction, under existing law they are guilty of treason. Possibly our laws should be strengthened. Instead of creating a great army of snoopers to go around and find out whether a man would prefer to have white people work for him in certain capacities, rather than Negroes, and spend great sums of money for that purpose, and stir up more race trouble, why not spend that money to do something about the Communists in this country, who are our real enemies? If we get rid of them, we shall be serving everyone of our people.

However, I do not hear very much discussion of that matter. Some persons would prefer to have the Senate kill time and provide a spectacle, such as the procedure now being indulged in in the Senate of the United States. Our attitude on the present proposals is no surprise to anyone, for everyone knows how deeply we feel about this matter. But some persons would prefer to have the present situation develop in the Senate, rather than to have Senators spend their time as statesmen and American patriots in trying to protect our people from a common enemy.

However, instead, we do the bidding of the common enemy, for we drag into this Chamber proposals which only consume the time of some of the statesmen of this Nation, if there are such in the Senate, and consume their energies in debating a matter which only serves to stir up more strife and to breed more disunity.

Mr. President, why do not some persons wake up to the actualities? Certainly there is plenty of work to be done by the Senate; there is plenty to engage the time of the Senate. There are many things for us to do; there are many things which the American people will applaud us for accomplishing. But as I understand the present situation, it is proposed now that we jeopardize all other measures, for some persons take the position that the proposal now before us is paramount and simply must be fought out to a conclusion.

Mr. President, the letter which I have been reading continues, as follows:

We ask that you use your every effort in the passage of legislation to curb and oust every Communist and fellow traveler from our Nation.

Would not that be much better than hiring thousands of snoopers to run around, supposedly while enforcing a Fair Labor Practices Act, so-called? In the first place, Mr. President, they would not enforce it; in many instances they would trump up charges, merely to hold their jobs, for if they did not trump up charges, they would not have jobs. The

proposal is simply one to deprive some of our people of their rights under the Constitution of the United States, and to make them accept a social standard which they do not wish to accept and will not accept. This is an attempt to tear down traditions and to deny to many of our people their right to choose their associates. That is one of the greatest freedoms we have. If I do not like to associate with another man, and if I do not wish to have him visit me in my home, or if I do not wish to work with him across the desk from me in my office, in my place of business, I should not be compelled to do so. Freedom of choice in that respect is one of the greatest liberties our people enjoy—the right of choosing one's associates, as well as the right to choose one's religion and to worship God according to one's own conscience. Our people cherish their right to set up standards of society that are acceptable to them, and not be subjected to associations which are obnoxious to them.

This challenge is ours, the crusade of the twentieth century is with us, let us carry the torch of freedom, boldly and fearlessly, to every nation upon the face of the earth by the defeat of communism within our own borders, first.

Mr. President, that is the thinking and the message from a veteran of the last war, Mr. R. G. Johnson, of Rogers, Ark., who represents the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Arkansas.

Yes, Mr. President, we had better be attending to some things of importance. I understand the President of the United States, at least the administration, has decided the pending question is all-important; that the changing of the rules of the Senate, which, of course, carries with it the so-called civil-rights program, is more important than any other legislation, and therefore the issue must be fought out. I did not hear the President say it, but every implication from published newspaper articles and from partial quotations of the President, is that he has not only agreed to it, but has insisted upon it; and while he insists upon that, knowing exactly what condition it would provoke in the Senate, namely, a stymie to the enactment of other important legislation—notwithstanding that, those are the orders, and Senators are now attempting to carry them out.

While we have the Communists in America threatening to join enemies if war comes, and while we ought to be doing something about it, far more important than what we are trying to do—which will please the Communists if the effort is successful—with this situation facing us, the President takes a vacation.

My thinking is that if the other legislation needed to be enacted in this body is of less importance than the question which is now involved in the issue presented by the motion, in my opinion, every Member of the Senate could very well take a vacation; and if they go on a vacation instead of passing the proposed legislation, they would be doing a far greater service to the country to go fishing and take no action, than they would to remain here and fight battles such as the pending one, and finally im-

pose this iniquitous thing on the American people.

Yes, Mr. President, I should like to have a vacation. I have not had one in 6 years—not since I came to the Senate. These have been very trying times. Perhaps it is my fault. Perhaps I could take a vacation; perhaps I should. I need one now. I should like to be spared the present ordeal; but I shall never, so long as I serve in the Senate, shirk any duty my conscience tells me I should perform, and I should certainly be remiss in my duty if I did not speak out in opposition to the pending proposal—yes, more, Mr. President, I should be more than derelict in duty if I did not fight it with all the power and strength I have.

How is the result sought to be accomplished? The very fact that the motion is pending and such a resolution was offered is self-evident that the present rule of the Senate, if observed, does not permit of a cloture petition being filed against a motion, but only against a measure. It is being urged that such a petition affecting the motion is expedient, because without it, in all probability the Senate can never get the resolution to a vote—not for quite some time, at least. In order to get a vote, it is proposed to file a cloture petition.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true and necessarily a fact that the Committee on Rules and Administration would never have reported favorably a proposed two-thirds cloture rule if it thought the rule already eliminated loopholes, as some persons say the Chair should rule it does?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just said that is the best evidence that the present rules of the Senate do not permit a cloture petition to be filed against a motion. But, I may say to my friend that it is now proposed that the Chair overrule the precedents of the Senate, for expediency purposes, and hold that the rule does permit the filing of cloture against a motion. That is why I could not help but refer earlier in my remarks to how the Christ himself was condemned by overruling all precedents, through the power that reposed in the then governor, and through his not having the courage to stand against pressures.

I hope, Mr. President, if there is a cloture petition filed and an attempt made to get the President of the Senate to reverse the ruling made here less than a year ago by one of the ablest Members of the Senate, in keeping with past precedents of the Senate, when there was an opportunity then to appeal from it, and the present President of the Senate, then a Member of this body, took no appeal, it will be held that, if it was wrong then, that was the time to correct it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator from Arkansas not agree with me that an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but that it never came to a vote? Was not that the parliamentary situation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct; but we did not have to let it pass by without coming to a vote. Senators could have insisted on a vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for another question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was not the parliamentary situation in this body such at that time that the appeal itself from the decision of the Chair would have been subject to unlimited filibuster?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means unlimited debate; does he not? I should like to assist the Senator in asking his question. Yes; it was subject to unlimited debate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. If the Chair should so rule and were actually correct, then would it not have been wasting a great deal of time arguing about something when the rules already provided for it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Every Senator knows what the rules of the Senate mean. They are very plain. I do not think a wayfaring man could err in interpreting them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it not so obvious that the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the President pro tempore of the Senate at that time, was correct and in line with the precedents of the Senate that the Republican Senators did not press an appeal from his decision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course that is correct. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] asked if an appeal would not have been subject to unlimited debate. It would have been. But a motion could have been made to table the appeal at any time, and that would have cut off the debate and brought a vote. That is the same approach, the same tactics, the same technique as are now proposed to be used.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if it is not a fact that the parliamentary situation a year ago was exactly the reverse of this one, and had a motion to lay on the table been made in connection with the appeal by the Senator from Ohio it would then have made the ruling of the Chair final by action of the Senate? If the able Sen-

ator and those who had the same point of view—

Mr. McCLELLAN. There would have been a decision one way or the other. Whether the motion was laid on the table or not, it would have indicated the decision of this body.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Had the able Senator and those colleagues who felt that way about it been so sure, would they not themselves have moved to table the motion on appeal by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot speculate as to what any individual Senator on this side of the aisle might have done any more than my colleague can speculate regarding Senators on his side of the aisle. Some Senators still have some individual privileges in the Senate as to making motions and parliamentary moves.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. What would have been the point in Senators from south of the Mason and Dixon taking such action, when we had already won the fight?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was not our place to appeal. We did not want to appeal from a decision which was correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The decision of the distinguished Senator from Michigan was correct; is that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator mean the decision of the able Senator from Michigan?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Was it correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course it was correct. I am only hoping that the Senate will never, by any parliamentary finesse or technique—there may be many words that could be used to express it—resort to such expediency as may be thought necessary definitely to abrogate the long-standing rules of this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that, in addition to the precedents and the ruling by the Senator from Michigan, the situation, as we contend, had been observed by the Senate for 50 years by practically unanimous consent?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Of course no Senator was surprised at the ruling of the very able Senator from Michigan who then occupied the chair. His decision was correct. There was no real fight over it after he made it. It was accepted as settling the question. It would seem to me—and I care not how earnestly Senators want the enactment of the civil-rights program or a change in the rules—that within less than a

year's time, to urge or even request the present Presiding Officer, who was then the leader of the minority in this body, to reverse that ruling, would weaken confidence in the integrity of this body. In my opinion, that would be the result. If we cannot rely upon a continuity of rulings which conform to precedents of this body, then, Mr. President, how are we to know that the written rule today will not be a mockery tomorrow when a parliamentary question arises? What caused some persons to lose confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States and begin to criticize it? It was because, without rhyme or reason, it began overruling the long-established precedents of that Court. If we act in that way in the United States Senate we may bring down upon our conduct the condemnation of the American people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not the opinion of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas that if this resolution should be adopted and a gag rule be established in the United States Senate, certain forces in this country will immediately begin an attempt to impose a capital levy and follow that with a drive to socialize American industry?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is no limit to what some forces in this Nation will do to destroy America. When they make so bold as to announce that they will fight with the enemy in case of war, how can we have any confidence that they will not do anything in their power, small or large, to hasten the day of our destruction? As I have pointed out as I have tried to progress with my remarks this evening, every time we compromise a little they expect and demand more. We shall not appease them and prevent another war, and we shall not save America, by partaking of any part of communism in any form or fashion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the Senator's opinion that the Senators from the South, in opposing with every weapon at their command the adoption of this resolution, are fighting for the preservation of the American system of government and the American way of life, and are holding in check the forces of socialism and communism which would destroy our country?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in answer to the able Senator from Mississippi, without, of course, reflecting in any degree whatsoever upon the Americanism, patriotism, and statesmanship of any other Member of this body, I do say that, in my opinion, the faith of the people of the South in their ideology of democracy and Americanism under this Government is unsurpassed in America or anywhere else in the world. We may have our faults.

We may have our faults; no doubt errors have been made, of course, but who has not made them? However, on the question of patriotic integrity, we make

no apology and surrender to no other segment of our population, East, West or North.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I shall read a letter from a southern mother. I have had a copy of it placed on the desk of each Senator. The lady does not live in my State at present; she has lived in a number of States. She lives in the South. I challenge anyone to read the letter and tell me that there is any higher quality of true Americanism than the sentiments expressed by this mother.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair]. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree that the right of free debate in the United States Senate is actually one of the greatest bulwarks this country has against communism or action by pressure groups, or groups that would overthrow our Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have said that repeatedly. Certainly it will not strengthen America to weaken the rule we are discussing. It can only serve those who want to impose their will on America, and unless we do preserve the power and the strength and the instrumentality of resistance, we can lose our liberty.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator recall the statement made by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] a few days ago that in his opinion the famous Court-packing bill of 1937 would probably have been passed by the Senate if the right of free and full debate had not prevailed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I remember that very well. I was serving in the House of Representatives at that time, and when the President came in person and delivered his message, I stood and applauded and thought that what he suggested would be a wonderful thing to do. If the Supreme Court was behind with its work, if the docket was congested, and more judges were needed in order to expedite the Court's business, I thought it would be a wonderful thing to do. If the bill had been brought up that day, or any time immediately thereafter, if there had not been debate on it, and I had not learned what the real situation was, I would have gone along. That shows the advantage of debate, the advantage of unlimited debate. Unlimited debate is one of our safeguards.

Mr. LONG. After mature reflection, and looking back on the subject historically, would not the Senator be of the opinion that if the United States Supreme Court had been packed at the request of the Executive, that would have had the effect of undermining a great portion of the American democracy?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the Court should be packed by the Executive at any time. Of course, it is the prerogative of the Executive to make appointments when vacancies occur, in order to keep the personnel of the Court complete, but such appointments can only be made after confirmation by the Senate.

To increase the Court so as to change the philosophy and thinking of the Court in order to achieve a definite result in regard to legislation which, in the opinion of the Court previously appointed in the proper constitutional way, was unconstitutional, is a subterfuge I do not think should ever be resorted to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator say that if it had not been for the right of unlimited debate in the Senate, or the right to resort to long debate in 1943 and 1944, a soldier-vote bill would have been rushed through this body, under gag rule, which would have jeopardized the election of President Roosevelt in 1944?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some said that would have been the effect. At the moment I do not recall all that was involved in the fight, but I do remember that there was quite a long debate on the bill, and the bill did not pass in the form in which it was presented.

Mr. President, I am very much concerned about what may happen in this body if a cloture petition is filed and cloture attempted. I am concerned about it because I would want to be here and vote on it, but it appears now that may be impossible. But I cannot refrain from saying that if a cloture petition is filed before those who want to speak on the pending motion have an opportunity to do so, it is a further warning, and a significant warning, of what we may expect when the rule is changed. Senators need not be under any illusion that a change in rule in accordance with the pending resolution is all they are going to have to contend with. That is only the beginning. It is merely an entering wedge.

I had prepared to say, Mr. President, that the effort now being made to amend rule XXII of the Senate rules will serve as an opening wedge further to gag this body. Rule XXII was designed to shut off debate in the Senate. It has done that in the past, and can do so in the future, and I dare say that if and when there were an occasion when the Nation could not afford not to have action in the Senate, when its interest would actually be jeopardized, the rule as it is would work again as it has in the past.

If Senate Resolution 15 should be adopted, it would undeniably serve as a precedent for again amending the rule. The proposed rule is to make cloture apply to motions, or whatever the pending business may be, without changing the two-thirds majority required, but when the motion to bring it up in the Senate is made amendments are offered to change the rule so as to provide that a constitutional majority, 49 Senators, may invoke cloture. The movement did not stop there. According to press reports the President went further and said he wanted to see the number reduced to a simple majority, or 25 Members of the Senate. That should be a warning, and serve notice upon Senators that they should get ready for and expect further effort to restrict debate in the Senate by those who will want to cut off debate, and pass any measure that is proposed

without debate, without adequate deliberation. Those who make such proposals are not, in my judgment, serving democracy's interest and the welfare of the people of the Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem to the Senator from Arkansas extremely likely that if the rules of the Senate were ultimately changed to permit mere majority closure, any time a capable and able leader saw his majority was getting away from him due to the effect of arguments on the opposing side, he would probably move to cut off debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say it is not possible to delegate power without expectation that the power will be used, and no power possibly was ever granted that was not sometimes abused. I think we could expect it to be used, and often abused in order to cut off debate, in an effort to try to get hasty action before the Nation could be informed of the real merits of what was involved in the issue, and have time to form intelligent judgment, and to express its will and wish, through its elected representatives in this body. Yes, Mr. President, I think the thing proposed to be done is dangerous.

There is no pleasure and there is no comfort in standing on the Senate floor and enduring the discomfort we endure here, when pleading, hoping, praying that some Senators will yet see the light, hoping we can by persuasion restrain the decision which some Senators may desire to have made, and thereby put in motion forces which are destructive, and can never be stopped.

Mr. President, there is now before us the proposal by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to amend Senate Resolution 15, so that cloture might become effective by vote of a majority of those elected. Then we have next heard, as I said, Mr. President, that the President of the United States favored the further amending of the rule so that cloture may be invoked by a bare majority of those present, which could be as few as 25 Members.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that some Senators who are now supporting Senate Resolution No. 15, with its change in the rules, have at different periods in the past advocated either a change to provide for cloture by a constitutional majority, or even by the simple majority to which the Senator has just adverted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator is correct; yes.

Mr. HILL. And is there not testimony from some Senators in the record of hearings before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration to the effect that they look upon the resolution as simply one step? Is it not a fact that the implication is inescapable that if they can take this step then they will be back to take the other step, which will be either a provision for a constitutional majority, or perhaps even for a simple majority, which under certain

circumstances may mean only 25 Senators?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. I take it, Mr. President, that whenever we reach that point in the United States Senate there will be little protection for the American people. There will then be little restraint to compel the Senate to deliberate before it acts, because there will be a continuously increasing volume of business, continually increasing pressures for legislation in a government which has grown as ours has in the past quarter of a century. Our Government has grown from one which expended for governmental purposes two or three billion dollars, to one which expends over \$40,000,000,000 a year. For such a government certainly more legislation is required, and greater care, greater effort, and greater labor are demanded on the part of the Appropriations Committees to try to determine how public funds and tax revenues shall be expended. More legislation is required to provide the agencies of the Government necessary to administer, supervise and expend judiciously the funds which are appropriated for the several functions and services of Government which the people in a growing nation like ours require.

So, Mr. President, every time we relax this rule or that rule, a rule intended to protect minorities, we are simply relaxing further and further the provisions for our protection, and weakening the bulwarks which have been set up to protect minorities, the very minorities to appease whom it is now sought to take action to change the rule.

The able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said earlier this afternoon, or possibly it was the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], that the minority some Senators now try to appease and to gratify by the enactment of the so-called civil-rights program is the very minority for which Senators would be tearing down the barriers of protection. We had better think about these things more seriously than we have heretofore.

While discussing this phase of the matter I should like to read excerpts from the statement I made before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the very reasons the Senator has so ably set forth here are the reasons why the Senate, through the years, has refused to deny free and unlimited debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think they are the reasons, and I think our forefathers and our predecessors in this great body had that vision.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield further for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there is sound wisdom, sound philosophy, and sound statecraft in these reasons which through the years have kept free and unlimited debate in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. Without undertaking to discuss in detail what had made America great, I tried to contrast

earlier today the difference between what our country stands for and what communism stands for. I said that books could be written on that subject. I pointed out that it was not communism or anything like communism which had made America great. That we know. I said there are two clashing forces in the world today. I asked: Do we want to keep whittling away our liberty a little bit at a time, and weakening the structure upon which our liberties rest, as was so ably discussed by the senior Senator from Georgia a few days ago? I say not. I say we had better move slowly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if we were to change the rules of the Senate we would not only change the procedure in the Senate, we would not only change the Senate itself, but we would make a fundamental change in the very American Government itself?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, we would. To those Senators who, by voting for the proposed change, believe it will have no significance, I point out that, in my opinion, they are thereafter going to be asked to go further. They may not be asked to go any further in the present session of Congress, but they will be asked to do so hereafter, or succeeding Senates will. Senators can then say, "Well, the Senate which made the change did not have to make it." Of course not. But the argument will then be made that the Senate now in existence made the change. If a change is once made, changes can be made again and again, and it is by that process of further encroachment, further taking away of the liberties we have heretofore preserved, one step further being taken each time, that finally the strength of our Nation is broken.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not the same old story of the camel once getting his nose under the tent?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is the same old story.

Mr. President, I was about to read—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question before he reads?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will yield for one further question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not of the greatest significance that with the exception of the so-called civil-rights bills, the proponents of this change in the rules are unable to put their hands on a single measure of any great significance or beneficence which has been defeated because of free and unlimited debate in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely true. Earlier in my remarks this afternoon I asked if there was any Senator who would dare say on the floor of the Senate that that was not the whole motivating cause behind the present proposal to change the rules. I do not think anyone would dare deny it. I went further and stated that I did not believe

that any Member of this body would dare make the assertion, and defend it, that any great harm had ever come to this Nation under the present rules of the United States Senate. There may have been a little delay and a little inconvenience, such as I and other Senators are now suffering in the effort to stop this awful thing from being done. Yes, there may have been a little delay and a little inconvenience, but I challenge any Senator to rise on the floor of the Senate and point out where, in all the years this rule has been in existence, America has suffered by reason of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that on May 4, 1918, while this country was in World War I, a resolution was submitted and presented to change the rules of the Senate so as to cut off free and unlimited debate for the duration of World War I, and that that resolution was defeated? We fought the great World War I. We made that herculean effort, and not a single soul can point to any act which brought any suffering or any impairment of the war effort, or any weakening of that effort because that resolution was defeated and because free and unlimited debate was preserved in this body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Since then we have fought a much larger war, with the rule unchanged.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that we fought a much larger war, and that at no time was there any effort to cut off free and unlimited debate in order to pass any measure for the prosecution and winning of that war?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In all probability, had the rule been changed and had the rule been during the war what the President of the United States says he now wants, some of the very forces which are now demanding that we change the rule would have been able to draft the railroad boys into the military service in order to break a strike. A motion could have been made and debate could have been cut off, and they could have been in uniform before night, figuratively speaking.

Mr. President, that is a dangerous power to grant to any man. If the Senate is unwilling to retain the power it now has to protect minorities and to make certain that the American people can be informed on the issues involved before final action is taken, then we shall be making a sad mistake.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the American Federation of Labor foresaw the very danger to which the Senator has just adverted in citing the illustration of killing the bill to prevent the drafting of the railroad workers, when the American Federation of Labor passed the stinging resolution condemning the proposal of Vice President Dawes to cut off free and unlimited debate in this body?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, indeed, Mr. President. While some of the labor leaders are writing letters insisting that we vote to change this rule, let me say that

that is the very thing that I am trying to point out. When I prepared the statement which I gave before the Rules Committee I was hoping that I might appeal to the wisdom and judgment of some of my friends across the aisle, because I knew that a large number of Senators on this side of the aisle would oppose it. As I said earlier in the day, I thought the issue transcended partisanship, and I hoped that I might make some suggestions which would cause every Member of this body to stop and think.

This is the statement which I made before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

You have before you some five Senate resolutions proposing to relax this rule in varying degrees, even to the extent of abrogating the provision that requires a two-thirds vote to invoke cloture and thus limit debate on any pending measure.

I oppose the adoption of any and all of these resolutions, and I appreciate this opportunity to state briefly for the record some reasons for my opposition.

Any change in this rule will be a radical departure from long-established precedent.

When we come to depart from precedent there ought to be some real reason for it, if that precedent has served us well in the past. Why should we depart because of some whim, or to pass one particular bill, or two or three bills, to please minority groups, and for no other reason in the world? Why should we shatter precedent and disregard it or abrogate it, or overrule it? When we do so we are resorting to expediency. If we are to legislate all the time under the pressure of expediency, we cannot preserve our Constitution or the things it stands for.

That is the reason for the Constitution. That is what rules and precedents are for. I do not mean that they cannot be changed, but they certainly should not be changed for the sake of expediency, to gain a single objective without looking to the general results which may follow after the change is made.

Continuing with my statement before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Some of the changes are designed and intended to so liberalize procedure in the United States Senate as will enable a bare majority to compel in some instances hasty, ill-advised action on any pending matter. They will serve to enforce the will and purpose of the majority on the Senate and the people without granting opportunity for due deliberation, and before the people can be sufficiently informed to give enlightened expressions and make their views known on the vital issue then pending.

The present rule has long stood the test, and has stood like a sentinel on guard providing an armor of defense against the enactment of ill-considered measures and those often sponsored to appease minority groups for political expediency, measures that would transgress the constitutional rights of majorities and substitute and impose the will of minorities on the body politic.

Mr. President, in my opinion every one of the pending proposals is unconstitutional. Earlier this afternoon I was speaking when some Senators who are now present were not in the Chamber. I was speaking about the FEPC. Why is the Federal Government asked to pass

such a law when every State has the right to pass it, and every State which has undertaken to pass it, and has left it to the vote of the people, has met with failure, because the American people do not want it? Why do we want to have this battle for days and days, in an effort to change the rules of the United States Senate if we do not want, by Federal legislation, to impose a diabolical thing on the people of America, who do not want it and who reject it at every opportunity that is afforded them?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the FEPC proposal has been defeated approximately 15 times in approximately 15 States of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I understand. It has never been approved by the people, wherever it has been submitted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in the State of California the FEPC proposal was not only defeated, but it failed to receive a majority of the votes in a single county in the entire State of California?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true. Let me say to the very able Senator from Alabama that it seems to me that one of the reasons why it failed in every county in the State of California may be attributed to some of the debates in the Senate of the United States, which informed those people of the iniquity of that proposal and of other proposed legislation of a similar character.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question at this point?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if the Members of the Senate had been denied free and unlimited debate, it might well have been impossible for those speeches to have been made here in the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely true. Even despite the present rule and what we know it is and what it has repeatedly been held to be, there is now a hope on the part of some persons, in order to secure the enactment of these proposed laws, to have the precedents of the Senate overruled, and then to have sufficient pressure applied here to cause that action to be sustained.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Then, does not this FEPC question boil down to about this situation: Does it not mean that the majority of the people of the country, when they understand what the FEPC proposal is, are opposed to it, but a small pressure group, exerting pressure on a majority of the Members of the United States Senate, is actually attempting to force upon the majority of our people what the majority of the people themselves do not want?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is certainly the only logical conclusion at which I can arrive.

Mr. President, the only reason why Senators want the proposed change in the Senate rule is to permit the passage of the proposed civil-rights program. If the people of the several States want an FEPC, such a law can be adopted in the States where the people want it, and it can be made just as airtight as is desired, so long as the Constitution of the United States is not violated, for, of course, it would not be legal for the Constitution of the United States to be violated under either a State statute or a Federal statute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the FEPC bill which was before the Senate in 1946 would have violated right after right which the Constitution and Bill of Rights guarantee to the American people?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely true.

Mr. President, I hope I can induce some of my colleagues to think about the importance of this matter. Today Senators on the other side of the aisle are in the minority. Perhaps after another election they may be in the majority, or perhaps they may remain in the minority. However, regardless of whether they are in the majority or are in the minority, they should carefully bear in mind the fact that the action proposed to be taken by the Senate will, if actually taken, forge a weapon which will be a dangerous instrumentality affecting all Senators. Certainly the majority can use it today to accomplish their ends, whether those ends be for good or for evil. However, the same majority, which creates and forges that weapon, will not always be able to retain control of it, for it will exist in the future to be used against them whenever they are in the minority. Thus they will have created the very weapon which may mean their own destruction.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that approximately only 12 years ago the minority in the Senate had only about 16 votes, while the majority had approximately 80 votes; and is it not also true that in a situation of that sort—for that situation existed here only a dozen years ago, and it might again exist here at any time in the future—the one protection, the one shield, the one bulwark which the minority has to protect its rights is the right of free and unlimited debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true.

Mr. President, let me point out how far some persons might go in this matter. Today the most deep-seated convictions lie back of the inspired opposition to the pending proposal. I do not think anyone questions our sincerity. Members of the Senate would not stand on this floor time and time again, for generation after generation, fighting measures of this sort unless there were in their souls a deep and abiding conviction that the

proposal was wrong. I have not seen those who wish to have the resolution adopted exert half as much effort in an attempt to have it adopted as we do in trying to prevent its adoption.

Mr. President, what is proposed to be done now by those who advocate the adoption of this resolution? Although they realize that a number of Members of the Senate have very deep convictions regarding this matter, the plan is to file a cloture petition and have action taken on it, if possible, before a number of the Members of the Senate have an opportunity to be heard even once on this question. Is not that a warning to all of us? Once the power is granted, it will be used; let us make no mistake about that. It may be used when Senators are otherwise defenseless.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not entirely likely that if the Senate rule be changed so that two-thirds can impose cloture at any time, possibly as soon as the next Congress convenes a proposal may be made to change the rule so as to provide for cloture by simple majority vote; and then on the next occasion of the proposal of so-called civil-rights measures, the newly amended rule might be used, with the result that cloture would then be imposed as soon as the motion to apply the rule had been made?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly that is possible.

Mr. President, I wonder whether it is true that there is a plan to file a cloture petition immediately on the commencement of the session tomorrow—and thus deny to many Members of the Senate an opportunity to let their people know what the issues are from their point of view.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not the proposal to file a cloture petition in an attempt to shut off debate before half the Senators who oppose this resolution and who desire to speak against it have an opportunity to speak?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know when the petition is proposed to be filed; but if it is filed before Senators are given an opportunity to speak once on this proposal—whereas, under the rule they have a right to speak twice on any proposal—and if they are thus to be denied the right to speak even once, it certainly seems to me that the gag will be used if authority to use it is ever granted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the cloture petition is filed tomorrow, to the Senator's knowledge, what percentage of the Senator's will have spoken in opposition to the motion, who desire to speak?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not kept count, but according to my recollection,

I should say probably not over half will have spoken, of those who intended to speak. I may say to the able Senator from Mississippi I cannot possibly cover the subject in one speech and say all I had intended to say. I thought I had something I could speak about for an hour or two. Mr. President, I have not the physical strength, I cannot possibly hold out here in one speech through the hours of the night when Senators ought to be home getting some rest. While the President of the United States is vacationing we ought to have some rest, too; but we must remain here to fight this battle. That is the way I feel about it. But certainly, Mr. President—we certainly should have the right to debate the pending proposal. I do not know what the limit of my physical strength may be, but no matter if I held on until late in the night, if I am compelled to undertake to do so, I could not exhaust the subject. I should like to make another speech, under the rules of the Senate, when I shall have recuperated. I am supposed to have that right if I want it.

Mr. President, I cannot be here tomorrow to continue my remarks, and I cannot be here the following day, for reasons I need not state in the RECORD. But I should hate to be deprived of the right to be here and vote when the vote is taken, and I should hate to be deprived by my colleagues of the right and privilege of making another speech and concluding my remarks, getting into the RECORD for posterity, or for my own satisfaction at least, the fact that I have done everything in my power to prevent what it is proposed to do and to keep this evil from being imposed on my people. But now I do not know whether I am going to have that right or not. We have become rather strict here. We have got to apply a little pressure and a little gag; we have got to overrule the precedents, probably, and do a few other things I do not think should be done. In doing those things I think we are hurting our country. I think we shall finally come to the time when there will be some weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth in America if it is done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if cloture should be ordered on the resolution, thereafter there could be adopted by the vote of a majority of only those present and voting, an amendment which would change the two-thirds requirement of the resolution to any kind of majority, and that then, after the adoption of such an amendment, a simple majority of the Senate could adopt the resolution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is absolutely correct, if we let the resolution come up, and if we do not do everything in our power to prevent it. Of course, when it is once taken up, it is subject to amendment, and I do not know what pressure may be brought to bear; I do not know how the majority feel. The majority might be persuaded to amend the resolution further to abolish the two-thirds rule; I do not know. It is tampering

with a thing that is dangerous. But if it is determined to do it, I want the RECORD to show and history to record, if it should take note of my feeble efforts, that so long as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS are kept, they will show that I made the supreme effort of my physical strength and endurance to try to prevent the enactment of the proposed laws, which the change in rule is designed to expedite.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Then, is it not true that if cloture is adopted, and if the amendment reducing the required two-thirds to a simple majority, which in its barest form would mean only 25 Senators, should be adopted, no Senator could speak more than once, or longer than an hour, in opposition to the resolution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; that is the extent to which he could speak.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the amendment to the rule should be adopted, I ask the Senator whether he thinks it would be possible to legislate the civil-rights program into the hearts of the people of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, we may place it on the statute book, but as I have been pointing out regarding the FEPC, where the people have a chance to express themselves, they say they do not want it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is unanswerable to me. I simply cannot understand a Senator making a fight in this body to change the rule, in order to pass an FEPC bill that his own people have rejected and repudiated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact the Senator well recognizes, as do other Senators, that the FEPC cannot be enacted into law, and that if it is, it will be no law, because of the impossibility of legislating such things into the people, does not the Senator believe the real purpose of the change in rules is to wreck the business interests of the country?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the FEPC bill should ever pass, as I said this afternoon, it would mean thousands of snoopers around meddling in people's business and putting control on the capitalistic enterprises of the Nation, under the domination of bureaucracy here in Washington. That is all it means. That is what it means; it means nothing less; it means that much and more. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, that this afternoon, earlier, in discussing the pending question, I pointed out to other Sena-

tors who were present that instead of spending millions of dollars to hire snoopers to run around and see whether a man was employing Negroes or white people or somebody else in the shops he himself had created—instead of doing that we had better be spending the money to track down the Communist spies in the Federal Government itself. There is the great danger. But no, we have got to undertake to interfere with private enterprise, and with the individual liberties of the businessman, hiring snoopers and boards, and using "cease and desist" orders and every other thing to tantalize him.

It is said that much can be done by conciliation. Senators know how conciliation is carried on. The conciliator goes to a man and looks at him in a conciliatory manner, calculated to convey the idea, "Well, you had better do this"; and he had better do it that way, or else; if he does not do it that way, of course, he knows he can be dragged to the Capital and carried on through the courts possibly. Many people will go ahead and yield to some of the demands in the hope of escaping a long-drawn-out, expensive hearing, court procedure, and so forth. But, Mr. President, that is a form of coercion and intimidation, nothing else; because the conciliator will come back after using such methods and tactics and make a report that he has been able to work the thing out by conciliation, and by mediation. It is a form of totalitarian rule; we cannot get away from that. That is what it will be, if we ever get it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator recall any bill which the administration has sent to the Congress that was strong enough and had sufficient teeth in it to track down the Communists in the employ of the Government?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we had a bill such as that in the Congress, the same elements which are now trying to force civil-rights legislation through the Congress would be here fighting and talking about individual liberty and preserving freedom. The Communists would be the first to holler if we attempted to invoke any law against them. They would take all the advantages of the Constitution, although they want to destroy it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that this resolution has been advocated by the administration, does the Senator know why such a thing is recommended when the Democratic Party did not recommend it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot reason out, understand, or fathom all of the purposes back of the administration's program. I never have been able to do so, and I cannot at this time.

Mr. President, I want to read a little more of what I said before the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Section 2 of rule XXII is an imposing bulwark of true democracy.

Through the years it has served to safeguard the liberties of our people and has afforded them the right of thorough expression through the medium of their chosen representatives in the United States Senate.

Strike down and destroy if you will this fortress and protection of free and unlimited debate in the most profound legislative body in the world, but I want no part of the evil that will flow from such action charged against my official record and conduct as a public servant.

Contention is made with great emphasis that the present rule permits abuses. Abuses have occurred. I have witnessed some of them since I have been a Member of the Senate, in some instances by those who now clamor for a change.

But those abuses, Mr. Chairman, while they may have caused temporary delay and have served to inconvenience other Members of the Senate, their attainments and any harm that resulted as a consequence were infinitesimal in comparison to unwise and unsound legislation that would have been passed had the rule been different, if it had conformed to the changes now proposed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the right of free and unlimited debate in the Senate throws its cloak of protection not only around the greatest and most powerful corporations, but also around the humblest and the lowliest citizens of the United States?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It certainly does. The proposed change is actually not in the interest of anyone. As I said earlier in my remarks, one of the tests which we can safely make is that if the Communists favor legislation which is pending, it is time to stop, look, listen, and beware. I think every Communist in the world is applauding everything that will break down the protection and safeguards of the minority. I think every Communist in America and abroad will applaud every vote to change this rule. They will not applaud my vote or the votes of my colleagues, these able Senators who are helping in this fight. That I know. I am not trying to please the Communists. If I should do such a thing I would begin to wonder about my own integrity.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the able Senator from South Carolina for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator know of any State in the Union, other than New York, in which an FEPC bill has been passed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know the circumstances of how it was passed in the State of New York. I know there have been efforts to try to introduce such legislation in several States, but every time it has been suggested the people have rejected it and refused it. Yet certain Senators are trying to pass such legislation here.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator realize that such a law was attempted to be passed in the State of California?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. That has been discussed this afternoon.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that Mr. Dewey, who was instrumental in having an FEPC law passed in New York, carried the State of New York over Mr. Truman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether that had anything to do with it. Whether the FEPC law had any particular influence on the election in that State I have no knowledge. I think we have plenty of concrete examples in the instances of some 12 or 15 States in which such a law has been proposed and has been submitted to the people themselves, but in each instance, I am advised, the people of those States—some of them are in the North, some in the West, but I do not think there are any in the South—have declared they wanted no part of it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that Henry Wallace received more votes in the State of New York than in any other State?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. Of course, New York has more votes than has any other State in the Union.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say, in proportion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I think that is correct. It simply means that Mr. Wallace received very few votes in a State like that of the able Senator from South Carolina, or in my own State, because our people are red-blooded American citizens; they love the American way of life; they love everything for which we are fighting here tonight. That is why they are not easily deluded and deceived and why they do not vote for false "isms" and false doctrines which, if they were adopted in this country, would mean the loss of the liberty they love.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that the way the so-called pressure groups work is to play the Democrats against the Republicans, and the Republicans against the Democrats, and then wind up going for some Communist, for Henry Wallace, or some odd party?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. Some of the folks who voted that way were, of course, misinformed, not capable, possibly, of appreciating what they were really doing. But a great many persons who voted for Henry Wallace were persons who want to overthrow this Government. I am not so sure that Henry Wallace does not want to do it, himself.

Mr. President, I have said this before, but I do not think I have ever said it in this Chamber. I remember that in 1944 at the convention in Chicago, at the time President Truman was given the nomination for Vice President, among

the group who made the fight to make certain of Harry Truman's nomination over Henry Wallace, are men who are here tonight fighting to preserve the liberties of the people in which we believe and which we did not believe Henry Wallace believed in then.

Whatever service I may have rendered in the National Congress at any time, I say to my friend from Alabama, to my friend from South Carolina, and to you, Mr. President, the greatest service I have ever rendered my country up to this hour was when I helped to defeat Henry Wallace and to nominate Harry Truman for Vice President of the United States in 1944. Whatever may be the President's errors of judgment now, whatever else he may try to do, I know that my own judgment is that if Henry Wallace had been the successful nominee, and had become the President of the United States, there would be a gag rule in the Senate by this time. That is his philosophy of government. We all know that that would have happened if he could have had his way.

I say, Mr. President, these are dangerous times in the world. We had better be on guard in this body every day, every hour. We cannot trifle with these off-hand formulas and philosophies. It is dangerous to do it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from South Carolina, for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall ask only one question, namely, is it not true that in 1944 there was an effort almost all one night to put gag rule on the Democratic Party, so to speak, by stampeding the convention in Chicago, when many of us who are here fighting today supported Harry Truman against Henry Wallace?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I remember that well, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that I know that my able friend from South Carolina, my able friend here from Virginia, and other Senators, stood with us in that fight, and kept Henry Wallace from becoming President of the United States. Mr. President, I guess it is now forgotten. I wonder if it is remembered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if he does not remember the large groups around the auditorium in Chicago, and the parades, and all the rest, that tried to beat us down that night?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, yes; I remember it, Mr. President; but people who have convictions, and who believe in the Americanism that we believed in that night, and in which we still believe, are not easily beaten down, nor are they easily threatened or intimidated. It sometimes takes a great deal of courage to carry out one's convictions and meet the obstacles which are placed in the way. It takes courage to come into this Chamber and stand and do one's duty under threat of political defeat. Most of us who are in politics, and who come to the Halls of Congress, or to any other office or position of importance in the

Nation, like to have the realization and the comfort and the gratification of knowing that we can serve well enough in this body, or in whatever position of trust we hold, so that we can be re-elected, if we desire to be, when the time comes. Men who serve in this body now dedicate their lives to public service, to serving their country. They do not have the opportunity, as was true perhaps in the earlier period of our Nation's history, to spend most of the time engaged in some private enterprise or vocation. We have to devote practically our entire time to our public duties, and our very pride in success makes it at least a possible temptation to us when people say "If you do not vote this way or that way, this group, our group, will see to it that you are defeated in the next election."

It takes a good deal of courage to stand the test and go through the fiery furnace we are sometimes compelled to endure in public service, but unless we have enough men in the Congress of the United States who will not thus be threatened and coerced and intimidated, and who will have the courage to walk up here and vote their convictions on the vital issues of the day, there is not much hope of America enduring indefinitely. It is that kind of courage which built America. It is that kind of political courage and political sacrifice which may be necessary to preserve this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not believe that minority groups are stronger in the industrial centers and in the large cities than they are in the great back country whence he and I come, and if he does not believe that we can see the picture more clearly, without threats and without fear? We have no fear. There may be threats, but we pay no attention to them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have never worried seriously about threats, but I do know that making threats is the tactics which seem to be employed in modern times by groups and organizations. They do not ask too often what we honestly think of the merits of an important question. We are not supposed to think. They want us merely to jump through the hoop.

I am sure every one of the Senators received a letter like the one sent me. I do not think I will have time to refer to it. I believe it was from the CIO, a letter telling us how to jump through the hoop. I do not think I am jumping. I am going to do what my conscience tells me is right, and my conscience does not tell me that the position this organization is taking on the proposed change in the rules is right. I think it is wrong, and I am not going to vote for a change in the rules.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—  
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator remember that last year an attempt was made by the Senator who is now the

distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration to suggest a constitutional amendment on the poll-tax question, and that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Walter White, sent a telegram in an effort to persuade the Senate not to pay any attention to the constitutional-amendment method proposed last August on the poll-tax question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct, and while an anti-poll-tax bill is involved in the fight we are making, let me say in all fairness that I do not believe the people of America want the FEPC in many States, and the 13 States in which it was voted on were not Southern States, but it was rejected. If those who desire to abolish the poll tax had gone about it in a constitutional way some few years ago, by constitutional amendment, and had not wanted to force it arbitrarily by statute, I think the resolution proposing the constitutional amendment would have passed both Houses and the amendment would have been on its way to the people in the due process of amending the Constitution. I believe in my State it would have been ratified, although we have a poll tax, because the people are ready to get away from it. They have been ready for some years. They merely wanted to find a better system, and had a Federal constitutional amendment been submitted, realizing that it would probably have been ratified by most of the States, or the required number of States, the proponents of the repeal of the poll-tax laws would have gotten by persuasion, by due constitutional processes, what they wanted, long ago; whereas they have not been able to get it, they have delayed the attainment of it, by the method they used, which we think is unconstitutional.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Would not the fact that the Communists and many of the pressure groups oppose a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax, although they scream and shout that the poll tax should be removed by congressional legislation, pretty well indicate that the pressure groups do not want to do anything for anybody, but rather seek to get something to scream and shout about?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say, respecting some of them, that all they want to do is to agitate, and if they were not agitating about this matter they would be agitating about something else. I am talking particularly about the communistic elements. They cannot be pleased, they cannot be compromised with and settled with. Their purpose is to continue agitation. They want anything about which to agitate. They will get on one side or the other, it does not matter, so long as they think they can stir up disunity in the United States and provoke discord.

Mr. President, I wish to continue reading the statement made by me before the committee. I regret that more Republicans are not apprehensive about the possible effect the proposed action will have on them. But I want to emphasize the statements I made before the Rules and Administration Committee. I read further from my statement:

Contention is made with great emphasis that the present rule permits abuses. Abuses have occurred. I have witnessed some of them since I have been a Member of the Senate, in some instances by those who now clamor for a change.

But those abuses, Mr. Chairman, while they may have caused temporary delay and have served to inconvenience other Members of the Senate, their attainments and any harm that resulted as a consequence were infinitesimal in comparison to unwise and unsound legislation that would have been passed had the rule been different, if it had conformed to the changes now proposed.

Great stress is put on the argument for majority rule. Yes, Mr. Chairman, majority rule is a general rule applicable to all democratic governments. But, like all other general rules, its strength and virtues are emphasized by noted exceptions which are dictated by common fairness and justice.

The founders of this Republic, in their wisdom, recognized and provided for some exceptions to guard against the enforcement of the will of a mere temporary majority by requiring a two-thirds vote of the Members of both Houses to override a Presidential veto, thus establishing a check and balance that would better insure the enactment of wholesome legislation to promote the general welfare and protection of the people in the flouting of authority by an overenthusiastic or frustrated majority of their representatives in the Congress.

Why, then, Mr. Chairman, must this wise provision of the Senate rules now be tampered with? There is no compelling need for these proposed changes except to serve political ends.

If there were no civil-rights program pending, these resolutions, in my opinion, would never have appeared on the scene in this session of Congress.

Obviously, those who advocate the enactment of measures embraced in the so-called civil-rights program realize the deep and unshakable convictions in the minds and hearts of those of us in the Congress and millions of other Americans who oppose the enactment of those measures. In an effort to overcome this unyielding opposition, they are now willing to resort to this tactic and attempt a change in the long-established, well-tested, and able-serving rules of the Senate in the hope of gaining an advantage that will enable them to enforce their will upon the Nation.

I wish the Republicans could listen to this:

Is such a victory worth the price they seem willing to pay? Is this rule to be changed just to serve this purpose? Do not the sponsors of these proposals know that the temporary advantage they may gain on the civil-rights issue now before the Congress is a two-edged sword? Do they not know that the same weapons they now attempt to forge and use to pierce the heart of the finest traditions of American democracy will ever remain available as a weapon to be seized and used for their own destruction when the situation may be reversed and they are on the defensive and fighting for a cause about which they have equally as deep convictions as do those of us who now oppose this procedure and the measures that inspire it?

By this process, Mr. Chairman, by these proposed changes in the rules, the majority is fashioning a dangerous legislative instrumentality. Its powers of destruction and evil will not long be controlled by its creators and those who first will use it.

Yes, Mr. President, overrule precedents if Senators want to get the resolution before the Senate, but when we overrule the precedent we are discussing then we invite the overruling of the next one which does not please us, and, simply to serve any temporary expediency, we can soon destroy the integrity of all the Senate rules. Are we willing to pay such a price? A Senate rule ought to mean something. We train and practice to play under the rules of the game, to observe the rules, and we rely upon them being observed, and expect to observe them ourselves. It will be a dangerous thing, Mr. President, to make such a change in the Senate rule as is now proposed.

Once it is established and its forces set in motion—

I am talking about this weapon—

its use will not be confined nor limited to those who create it. It will then become an accepted form of warfare in legislative battle, and the know-how and use of it can, and will, be employed to every advantage it will serve, not only in the impending battle on civil-rights measures, but with equal force and destructiveness against those who are willing to change the rule as an expediency to gain this shallow victory.

These proposed changes will not insure against abuses in parliamentary procedures in the processes of legislation in the future. These changes will invite greater abuses in the enactment of unwise laws than has already occurred under the present rule.

The present rule has been used to prevent hasty action on measures about which there was deep feeling and strong division not only among the Members of the Senate but among great sections and segments of the American people.

The changes now proposed would place a far greater advantage in the hands of those who are more responsible to pressure groups and political considerations.

Which is the safer course, to forego temporarily or for a season the enactment of some law or laws that are highly controversial, although they may be highly meritorious, until the people can become enlightened and convinced of their merit and are willing to accept it, or change the rule so that a mere majority can enforce the enactment of legislation at will and undertake to compel the American people to abide by what they may regard as an unjust imposition on them?

Which is the safe course for our Nation? Which course has most in principle and virtue to recommend it, in keeping with the finest traditions of our democracy? Which course will better safeguard and protect the liberties of our people?

My answer is to retain the present rule.

Mr. President, I digress at that point to say that the faith which I have in the American people, to which I have referred, has been exemplified by the reports of what the American people have done in the States where they have had an opportunity to vote on an FEPC law. All we are fighting for is to keep government next to the people themselves.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if the American people had wanted the rules changed, or had thought that it would be wise to change them, they would have been changed long ago?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no doubt about it. The proposal to change them now is based upon political expediency, and nothing else.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for another question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the rules have remained as they are, and free and unlimited debate has been retained in the Senate, because the people themselves recognized the wisdom of retaining free and unlimited debate, and have given their consent and approval to the retention of free and unlimited debate in the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. During the last campaign I did not hear anyone say that any political party had a mandate to change the rules of the Senate. So far as I know, the people have never made any demand for a change in the rules of the Senate. The request for a change in the rules comes from the very elements which seem to me to be the least American and the least interested in the survival of America, of any class, group, or segment in our Nation.

Mr. President, no one enjoys a contest of the character of that now being waged in the United States Senate. When we undertake to do these things in the constitutional way, and bring about reforms constitutionally, I think the American people will make a more favorable response. As I said a few moments ago with respect to the amendment to the Federal Constitution regarding the poll tax, I believe that it is within the province of the people to delegate to the Federal Government the power to prohibit the poll tax. But I also believe that the American people have not yet done it. They did not do it in the Constitution, or in any amendment which has been made thereto.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if he does not believe that the American people and those of us who are opposing this legislation would be glad to follow and support the Constitution which we took an oath to support, not only with respect to the poll tax, but with respect to all other measures?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator. I am sorry, but I cannot yield except for a question. I have not yielded except under the rulings of the Chair, for a question. I know that no Senator wants to violate the rule. I can well appreciate that sometimes in asking a question Senators wish to express their own views. However, I am sure that no Senator wishes to take advantage of the present rules or interfere with the determination to see that they are rigidly enforced during this debate.

Mr. President, I did not quite conclude reading my statement before the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration. I continue:

I have an abiding faith in the wisdom and final judgment of the American people. They may be slow to accept change in the fundamental laws of our land.

They have been slow, Mr. President. In the history of this Nation we have not had very many amendments to the Constitution. They have been slow to change because they had something wonderful, the greatest document ever penned by the hand of man; and certainly they are going to be slow to change it. They ought to be. That is the only way we can have safety and security and protect our Government. Rapid changes, hastily conceived, hastily advised, hastily legislated, and hastily executed would destroy any freedom that any government ever instituted among men.

They may be slow to accept change in the fundamental laws of our land, but once they are enlightened and informed—

That is what debate is for— they can be relied upon to make the right decision.

They may make mistakes because they have not been adequately informed. Some of them may be making a mistake in saying that they favor the civil-rights program; but if we are permitted to inform them, most of them will change their opinions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that they have not made very many mistakes so far as fundamental changes are concerned?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe that is true. That is what I was speaking of. I said that the people were slow to make changes in the fundamental law of our land. We can make changes in statutes. We can repeal a statute in a few days if we do not like it, or a month or a year later. If after trial and test in the administration of it, and after gaining experience, we decide that we have made a mistake, we can change the statute and no serious harm is done. But if we propose a constitutional amendment, our people are slow to change, because a constitutional amendment cannot be repealed as easily or as quickly as can a statute.

Mr. President, some time ago in my remarks I started to discuss another phase of this question. I have found it very difficult to follow through with any particular line of thinking. Because of the keen interest in this issue there are many questions in the minds of Senators, and those questions, as they are asked, often lead us away from the line of thought which we had prepared for our remarks.

I made some references to parliamentary decisions, and expressed the hope that no action would be taken by the Chair, or by those contemplating filing a motion for cloture, until all Senators who wish to speak on this question have an opportunity to be heard. I think it would be unwise for such action to be

taken until every Member of the Senate who wishes to speak twice on this issue, under the present Senate rule, has a chance to do so; but certainly every Senator should have an opportunity to speak at least once on it. When and if such a petition is filed and when and if a ruling in support of the petition is made, there should be sufficient time thereafter for every Senator who wishes to be present and vote on that question to have an opportunity to do so. Sometimes unavoidable circumstances prevent Senators from being present even on occasions when the Senate is voting on important issues. But the Senate can make it possible for most Senators who wish to be present and to vote on such issues to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, whether it is a fact that in the event that cloture is applied to the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that in itself would not cut off debate on the merits of Senate Resolution 15, but would merely move it up one additional step; and is it not also true that then Senate Resolution 15 would be subject to full debate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, the Senator from California knows that is possible under the rule; but the Senator also knows that under the rule, the minute the motion to have the Senate take up the resolution was adopted, it would be possible to file a cloture petition on the question of adoption of the resolution; and if cloture were then invoked, it would shut off debate on the resolution itself. Once the motion to take up the resolution was agreed to, and the resolution was before the Senate, certainly there would be a right to file a petition for cloture on the question of consideration of the resolution; it would not be necessary to wait as long as 30 minutes to file such a petition, once the resolution was taken up. Once the rule was thus changed for the sake of expediency, I do not know but that what I have just mentioned might occur, once the resolution itself was taken up. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to take any chances of having that done.

Mr. President, parliamentary decisions which have become precedents in the United States Senate should not be brushed away lightly for a momentary expedient to accomplish any given result, however meritorious or desirable that objective may be. The word "measure" as used in rule XXII does not mean "motion." The present matter before the Senate is a motion to take up a resolution, which can be done by majority vote. Cloture lies only against "a pending measure" under rule XXII of the Senate. Until the Senate agrees to take up a bill or resolution for consideration, it is not pending business. Under a correct interpretation of the present rule, cloture does not lie at any time—past, present, or future—against a "motion" to take up a

bill or a "motion" for any other purpose, until the present Senate rule shall have been changed. This has been recognized and accepted and confirmed repeatedly by parliamentary rulings by occupants of the Chair. Mr. President, if that were not the rule and the interpretation of it and the established usage of it, we would not now have before the Senate the motion to take up Resolution 15, and there would be no need for the resolution. The very existence of the resolution in the Senate is an acknowledgment that at present a cloture petition does not properly lie against a motion to take up a measure. That is why the attempt is made to have Resolution 15 considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator from Arkansas noted from the articles appearing in the press that some persons believe that the proponents of the resolution to change the rule might seek to invoke cloture not only against the motion to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Resolution 15, which provides for changing rule XXII, but also on the resolution itself, at one and the same time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true; I understand that is being considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that unless and until the motion to proceed to consider the resolution to change the rule is adopted by majority vote, the resolution will still be on the calendar and will remain there?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course. It is not now pending. If it were pending, it would be the measure under consideration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Arkansas know any way or earth to abide by the Senate rule and still invoke cloture on a resolution or a bill which remains on the calendar?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That has never been the interpretation of the present rule. I know of no way by which that can be done except by making the resolution the pending business, and that process has been undertaken. However, a cloture petition does not lie against a motion.

Let me say that if there is this much deep-rooted opposition to a measure, it certainly should not be taken up at a session of this sort, when so many important matters are waiting to be attended to, until such important business has been disposed of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator this question: Does not the fact that this proposal is made—and I refer to the double-barreled proposition of attempting to invoke cloture on a resolution still on the calendar—show how far the proponents of the proposed change in the rule would try to go in their efforts to bring about such a change in the rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true, and that what makes me so apprehensive of this whole proposal and suggested procedure.

Mr. President, repeated parliamentary rulings have established, as a firm, fixed and unchallengeable precedent that rule XXII of the Senate, which now is in force, means exactly what it says, namely, that a cloture petition can be filed against a "measure," but not against a pending "motion," which "motion" is intended to determine the next course of procedure in this body.

The resolution which is the subject of the pending motion not only confirms but is within itself self-evident of this truth. Mr. President, I believe no one will challenge the statement I have just made as being a correct statement of the present rule of the United States Senate, insofar as it at present governs the processes and deliberations of this body.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did not the Senator from Arkansas just state that the change of the rule proposed by Senate Resolution 15 might very well lead to a further change of the rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say that the pending motion, if rejected, will dispose of the resolution, for if the motion to consider the resolution is rejected, we shall not proceed to consider the resolution. On the other hand, if the motion to consider the resolution is agreed to, we shall then proceed to consider Resolution No. 15. In short, the fate of the motion will determine the next procedure in the Senate; either we shall reject the motion, and then shall proceed to act on some other matter, or we shall adopt the motion and then shall proceed to consider Senate Resolution 15.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask the Senator whether in his judgment the adoption of the motion and the adoption of the resolution might lead to a further change of the rule?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It might very well do so, and that is what I am complaining about. I do not wish to see the rule changed. I do not wish to have the Senate vote to change it, and I do not wish to see the precedents which have governed the procedure in this body for so long a time be overruled.

The pending resolution not only confirms but is within itself self-evident of this truth. I believe no one will challenge the statement which I have just made as being the present law of the land so far as the rules of the Senate are concerned and insofar as they at present govern the processes and deliberations of this body.

Contention is made that the framers of the rule, that cloture could only apply to a measure, did not know what they were doing at the time, or intended something else. I am not prepared to question the integrity or intellect of those who framed this rule. Whether the rule is wise or unwise is not the issue.

They used simple language that anyone can understand. Yes, more, they used language that even a layman, a wayfarer, can understand. And no one need err therein. I dare assert that past rulings of eminent statesmen should be sustained. A reversal of established precedent will not only do violence to the integrity of the Senate itself, but it will go much further than that; it will shatter confidence in our legislative processes and will be a terrific, weakening blow to every safeguard to the liberty of the American people.

The significance of a ruling that would arbitrarily change the whole course of Senate procedure may be, and I readily concede it will be, a convenient expedient to serve those who seek to attain a specific objective, namely, the enactment of the so-called civil-rights program. If such ruling is made, it may well gain that immediate objective. It may be the simple but dangerous instrumentality needed for the moment that will be productive of presently satisfactory results. But what we do, or what is done about this, is not of temporary duration. If it would only accomplish what is presently intended, the forging of such a weapon ultimately might be excused and forgiven. But the weapon that will be fashioned by such procedure is one that will neither rust nor decay. Its effective striking power will remain for future occasions. Those who have created it for use in this battle, perhaps for a decisive victory, will not long retain control of it. They construct it, use it, and control it for today; but for today only. Tomorrow it will be in the hands of someone else; or, if not tomorrow, it will some day be in the hands of the adversaries of those who would now fight with it.

Mr. President, when the situation is reversed there will be "weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth." While it is all right to be contrite in spirit, and is certainly commendable to beg forgiveness, yet when mankind comes to the point of "weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth," according to the Scriptures, as I read them, it is "too little and too late."

What we do on this issue is not temporary. We cannot escape history. History is going to be written about this battle in the United States Senate, and history is going to record—and subsequent events are going to reveal that which history will record—if our opponents win this fight by relaxing the rules of the Senate, whether that victory served the welfare of America or whether it became one more blow to the liberty of the American people. The destiny of America will be influenced to some degree, either great or small; but, in my judgment, greater than we think, if an adverse decision is made.

I may say to those of the opposition, you may shatter precedents and bask in all of the glory of a victory gained because you have the immediate physical power to achieve it. But victory thus gained will have a way of turning sour. Such victories can very well consume those who resort to the use of such weapons, and the glory so gained, is a glory of the moment but a glory that will evaporate and be gone with the wind.

except to leave a stain on the pages of history. Yes, Mr. President, I should hate to see a ruling like that made.

Our founding fathers in forming our Republic, a union of the several States, were confronted with a dilemma. They wanted a Republic, but they did not want to create a government that was or could be autocratic. It was their purpose to form a union, a federation of the several States, primarily for the purpose of security and defense; but they also intended to keep the sovereignty of the States and the liberty of the individual citizen inviolate, hence the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The framers of our Constitution made certain in unequivocal terms that the Federal Government was to be a Government of delegated powers only, and not a Government of absolutism, a Government with authority only to exercise specific powers granted to it by the sovereign States and the people themselves. Powers not delegated were expressly reserved. Within that structure of Government the greatest liberty to the individual citizen has been assured and preserved.

Mr. President, I challenge any Member of the Senate to rise and give convincing argument that anywhere in the Constitution any of the three civil rights proposals is expressly the result of delegated power by the people or by the States to the Federal Government. It cannot even be read into the civil-rights program. It can be stretched, twisted, and distorted, but in the end, it does not fit.

So, Mr. President, our forefathers did not intend that action should be taken in this way. They intended, as I said before, that if the Federal Government did not want the States to fix the qualifications of voters, as the power was reserved to the States in the Constitution which was adopted, then the only way the Federal Government could get a change would be to carry out and follow the processes and provisions of the Constitution authorizing amendments to that document. The framers of our Constitution made certain, in unequivocal terms, that the Federal Government was to be a government of delegated powers only, and that the powers not delegated were reserved.

Within that structure of government the greatest liberty of the individual citizen has been assured and preserved in America up to this time. Are we to cut loose from that anchorage? Are we to set sail without guide, without course, and without controls?

Books have been written, and many more could be written, on the majesty and dignity of man under the American system of government. Books have been written, and countless volumes could yet be written, depicting the rapid growth and development of America, and undertaking to tell why we have eclipsed the growth and power of every other government and nation or empire that ever existed. But, Mr. President, whatever may have been written and what could yet be said about it, liberty of the individual has been the most potent factor of all. And associated with liberty—and it cannot be disassociated from it—is

some place, some forum, where the citizens, through his chosen representatives, can have freedom of speech, unlimited expression. Mr. President, there is today under the present rules of the United States Senate that one forum in existence. But only one, Mr. President. There is no other such forum in the world.

This body has been able to operate and function under the most liberal rules with respect to debate and with respect to speech and expression that the world has ever known. We built this great America under this system. Why is it necessary to change? There is today, under the present rules of the Senate, this one forum. If we change the rules and begin reducing and restricting that freedom which we now enjoy, we are simply, to the same degree, reducing the liberty and freedom of expression and the opportunity of expression of the American people whose representatives we are.

Mr. President, why do we have a United States Senate? What function as a safeguard, as a check and balance, was it intended to perform? Our forefathers, as the Constitution clearly directs, intended that Members of the House of Representatives should be close to the people and, therefore, provided that every Member of the House of Representatives should be elected every 2 years. If, Mr. President, it had been intended or if it were wise that legislation should conform to and carry out the immediate will of a temporary majority or the momentary popular sentiment of the people of this Government, there would have been no necessity in the world for creating this body, the United States Senate.

We hear a great deal about majority rule by representatives of the people. There was never any necessity for creating the United States Senate if whenever the will of the majority was ascertained it should immediately become the law of the land, irrespective of further deliberation and checking to make certain it was right, wise, safe, and sound.

I feel so deeply regarding the question, Mr. President, that I do not think any Senator who opposes the proposed change and who opposes the proposed civil-rights legislation ought to quit fighting this effort to impose such legislation upon the people of the Nation so long as he has the strength to fight. Of course, others have a right to think otherwise, but I reserve the right, so long as I have rights under the rules of the Senate, and have sufficient physical strength to do so, to speak out against this awful thing which is proposed to be done.

Mr. President, what is the United States Senate? The founding fathers intended that it should serve the very purposes which it has served throughout the Nation's existence. It was at first presumed that practically all legislation would originate in the House of Representatives, in which the membership was fresh from the people, and in which the Members were elected every 2 years, and that this body would be more of a supervisory, examining, and deliberative body to smooth out proposed

laws and bring them within the Constitution, or reject them if they were unconstitutional.

It was intended to serve as a check against ill-advised legislation and not necessarily to jump through the hoop every time someone thought he had a majority on his side of an issue.

Our forefathers intended that the Senate should be a deliberative body. While the Senate was not restrained from initiating legislation, it certainly was the idea of those who founded this Government that most legislation would originate in the House of Representatives, whose Members were fresh from the ranks, the emotions, the reactions, the sentiments, of the people themselves. But our forefathers recognized that majorities are sometimes wrong.

Oh, yes, Mr. President, the Senate was created so that there might be a check and a balance and deliberation until the people could become better informed and have an opportunity themselves to re-examine the vital issues of the day, and then, after doing so, could reelect their Members to the House of Representatives the next year, or they could reject a Member and elect another if he did not favor a particular issue.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator whether after the Philadelphia Convention the small States were not the first to ratify the Constitution and go along with the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true. The Senate was created also to give protection to the smaller States, the minority groups in political subdivisions. The House was constituted on the basis of population. The representation of each State in the House is determined by population, but in the Senate the smallest State has as much force and as many votes as do the largest States in the Union. How those from small States with small populations could begin now to whittle away the protection they have here for their people I cannot understand.

Mr. President, we are probably more often wrong than our forefathers thought we would be. They were pretty farseeing, but probably did not contemplate that in the twentieth century, when the tempo of ingenuity and events is carrying us at a rapid pace, we might be prone, under pressures of expediency within and pressures of diabolical intent from abroad, to surrender to that which appears necessary for the moment to gain the immediate result desired. An immediate victory perhaps can be gained, but it would be a victory of expediency constructed on sinking sands.

I wish to call attention to the proposed change in rule in connection with the question how some may expect it to operate. Some say the present rule may have been somewhat abused, and they will change the rule so as to stop up loopholes, as they are called.

What Senators call loopholes are actually further protection to minorities.

I call particularly to the attention of the Republican Members of the Senate, to whom I now wish to refer, that if they think they can change these rules and not have Democratic majorities take full advantage of them, they are mistaken. I think they have every evidence they need of that. They should know by now what gag rule is and what it can do to them.

Some of them are very much interested in legislation which is pending before one of the committees of this body, and they remember when that legislation was first referred to that committee by the Presiding Officer. I am referring to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They remember a measure of vital importance, in which there was great interest, not only on their part, but throughout the Nation. They remember the majority first undertook, without even holding hearings, to report that vital measure, which would have repealed a very important law passed during the last Congress. I think that was also true with reference to some other legislation. But Senators will remember they had to have a battle to get hearings on the bill, and after public hearings they had to have a battle with the majority to keep them from closing the hearings before they could have reasonable opportunity to be heard, or to have witnesses they desired to be heard brought before the committee. Finally, after the hearings were concluded, and the committee undertook to write up the bill, the gag was applied to the Republican members. Important as that bill is, and controversial as it is, the majority would not even give the Republican members the opportunity to present an amendment and have the committee vote on it. There was gag rule. Is the minority going to support it? Do they want some more of the same medicine? How consistent can they be, or how inconsistent will they be. I do not see how they can support it. They can expect a lot more treatment like that, if that is what they want. But they do not protect their people. Mr. President, you and I know that much time was lost by not trying to work out the bill in the committee.

I am persuaded that the pending motion is not the only measure which will come up in this body during this session which will cause some pretty long debate. But this is a sample of how a majority, where there are no rules to protect the minority, can operate. Think about it. If that is the kind of gag rule the minority likes, let them begin voting to change the rules of the Senate.

I am not going to have time to read a letter which was sent to me, an open letter addressed to the Members of the United States Senate, but I do wish to read the cover letter which I received from the lady who wrote this letter, which I have had mimeographed and placed on the desk of every Senator in order that my colleagues may have the opportunity—and I hope they will exercise the privilege—of reading this letter signed by an American mother from the South. I received the covering letter, which is dated March 4. I believe the letter enclosed with it, which is an open

letter to all Senators, is also dated March 4.

This letter impressed me. As I have said, I shall not have time, possibly, to read the letter tonight, but I have made it available to every Senator. I do, however, wish to read excerpts from the covering letter which the lady wrote, which was addressed to me personally, and with which she enclosed the letter I have made available to all my colleagues. The letter is dated, as I said, March 4, 1949, and is from an address in Tennessee. The letter, which is addressed to me, is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: From the bottom of our hearts—

And, Mr. President, as I read this letter it will explain why I had the other letter mimeographed and made available to all Senators:

From the bottom of our hearts, the mothers in the South are grateful to you and each and every one in the Senate who is trying to uphold the right to freely speak and to filibuster. We lived in Marianna, Ark., 4 years before coming to Tennessee. \* \* \*

Women in the North are becoming very powerful in political life, as can be seen from all the legislation they are sponsoring and trying to get women all over the country to sponsor in federated clubs, American Association of University Women, and even in church societies. In the South we are too prone to leave all the disagreeable tasks to the men, and take for granted things will work out all right.

I am not at all sure what the procedure is in getting a letter read on the floor or getting one on each Senator's desk. The enclosed article comes straight from the heart, and expresses the sentiments of thousands of us who have in the past been inarticulate. I did not know if it were possible, should I get it mimeographed, to have one placed on each Senator's desk and also have the southern Senator holding the floor in the filibuster also read it, or just how it could be handled. I am sending it to you to do with as you think best, as I see you will have the floor tomorrow. If it would do any good to have a copy given each Senator I would gladly pay such expenses.

Mr. President, I wish I could assure the lady that some good will come of her letter. I hope that it will touch the hearts of Senators, and cause them to think well before they vote to change the rule.

I quote further from her letter:

It has been hard for us, in the South, to get rid of the old thought that only "cranks" write to their Congressmen, and I do not want you splendid men to feel you are alone in your fight for our rights and liberties. The thoughts and prayers of thousands of women back home are with you and being said for you.

I have signed the letter as I did—

She is referring there to the letter which I have made available to each Member of the Senate—

I have signed the letter as I did—

And listen to this, as an indication of what people are thinking—

because it seems that anyone who opposes Mr. Truman in his platform is abused unmercifully and I don't want any member of my family to suffer because I believe as I do that all Americans should support a cause that he thinks is right. My son is a Reserve officer in the Air Corps, and I should hate for him to later be penalized because I have

taken part in supporting something the present administration is against. After all such tactics were in line with the gestapo and the Moscow regime, and seem wholly un-American to me, but Mr. Truman is in the driver's seat and seems to consider himself a dictator, rather than a servant to the people.

One of my father's great-great, etc., grandparents was a brigadier general in the Revolutionary War, and a member of the family has been in every war fought for freedom since, with the exception of the Spanish War when there was no man of fighting age. There are two small sons who will be in line for the next war that seems in the making, and I truly believe our lawmakers should be spending their time unifying the Nation and the peace-loving democracies, rather than causing strife and discord among our own people.

God bless you all. May the filibuster stay, the FEPC die its rightful death and President Truman become the President of all the people, and not just those who think as he does.

Mr. President, when I shall have concluded my remarks I shall hope to receive unanimous consent then to have the letter which I have made available, which the lady was anxious to have made available to every Senator, placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make any request now, or is he giving notice that he will make it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am giving notice, Mr. President, that I expect to make the request. I should like the letter to appear after I have finished my remarks, and not right in the midst of them, if I may.

I had in mind to discuss quite at length each one of the bills. But I shall not discuss them as fully as I had hoped to do. But I want to take a little while on the three bills. I do not know how long the leadership intends to hold the session tonight. If it is a rule that we are going to stay until 9 o'clock, I think I am prepared to stay, but of course if Senators think they have heard as much as they want to hear tonight, and if the leadership feels that way, we might quit a little earlier, but if not, Mr. President—and of course I cannot conclude, as I said—I shall have to speak again, if I receive that opportunity. But I want to talk now briefly about the three bills.

Mr. President, in the course of the debate today I have stated that the three bills now pending do not represent all there is in the civil-rights program. They are all the legislation which has been introduced so far in the Congress, but that is by no means all that is required to satisfy those who are agitating for so-called civil-rights laws. I stated earlier that many of those who are advocating these laws, and who are applying very serious pressure to try to get them, would not be satisfied with the enactment of the anti-poll-tax law, the antilynching law, and the FEPC. They will not be satisfied until they get the Negroes of this country into every swimming pool, every hotel, every place of entertainment, every church, every society, every club, and everywhere else where white people may assemble. That is what is behind the effort. That is the ultimate goal. If these three bills were

passed now, that would not end this controversy. The proponents of civil-rights legislation wish to go a great deal further.

Mr. President, that is something that a great many people in America are very sensitive about. We do not want such a condition to be forced on us by law. If such a condition ever occurs—and I doubt that it should ever occur in America—it ought to come through the processes of education and evolution, and not by a force act, as those who advocate that relationship between the races now propose. These proposals are in the nature of force acts.

It is not necessary to dwell long on the anti-poll-tax measure, because it is of little consequence. I think there are only seven States which have the poll tax. Some of them, and possibly all of them, are now in the process of making arrangements to eliminate the poll tax. I predict that before we could get an anti-poll-tax law enacted in the Federal Congress, there might not be anything against which to enact the law. Regardless of how rapidly or slowly changes come in the States, it is their right to make the changes. I hope that by the time we get through with this fight it will have been lost because it will be found impossible to force an unconstitutional measure like this through the Congress.

The poll tax has been greatly exaggerated by many. For example, my State has a poll tax. It is only a dollar. Every penny of it goes into the common school fund. In my judgment any sorry son-of-a-gun in America who is not willing to pay a dollar to educate our children does not possess such attributes of citizenship as to entitle him to vote, in the first place. We cannot get very good government from people who would complain about paying a dollar to help educate the youth of the land.

A great deal of racket is raised over the poll tax. It has been said that it prevents many persons from voting. In my State 450,000 poll taxes were paid this year. How many do Senators suppose voted for President? Only a little more than half the number who paid poll taxes voted for President of the United States. So it was not the poll tax which kept them from voting. Two hundred thousand of them had poll-tax receipts in Arkansas, but did not vote. Some other reason will have to be found.

Of course, these arguments have been made many times. I do not care to dwell too long on the poll-tax measure. Whether it is right or wrong, the States are changing it. They are instituting a registration system. That is what is occurring in my State. I do not know how soon it will be inaugurated, but the people have already acted on it and authorized the legislature to establish a registration system. I am not sure that the bill has passed, but it will probably be passed at the present session of the legislature. So that question is of no great importance. We do not care very much about a poll tax. That is not the violence represented in these proposals, although it is unconstitutional. But if we start voting for and passing laws which we know are unconstitutional, they will op-

erate just as the gag system operates. We shall continue to be gagged.

Mr. President, we took an oath to support the Constitution. I respect any Member of this body who, having taken such an oath, votes against a measure when he conscientiously believes and has a conviction that it is unconstitutional, whether he believes in the objectives of it or not. If he believes that the means of seeking to gain the objective are unconstitutional, he has my admiration if he adheres to his conviction and votes against the measure.

So far as the poll tax is concerned, it is overexaggerated. It is not a problem. I would not lose a minute's sleep if the poll tax were repealed in my State. I have always said that I did not care what was done about it. Every time the issue has been raised in my State, I have stated that I would just as soon run for office with a poll tax as without one. It makes no difference to me. When I go out to campaign, I am talking to my own people. If I cannot be elected with the poll tax in existence, I probably could not be elected without it.

We are using every penny of the money to support the schools. We need plenty of revenue to try to support the schools. I do not believe that this particular issue is all-important. Frankly, as I stated a while ago, I believe that any citizen who is so sorry that he would not be willing to contribute a dollar to help educate the children of the community possesses a doubtful quality of citizenship on which to base his right to vote. After all, the States can set the qualifications under the Constitution. They have set them, and when they set them, I think they have a right to set them.

Mr. President, I wish to pass to the next measure, the antilynching bill. From the time this measure was first introduced, it has been considerably watered down. The present bill does not go nearly so far as did some of the bills introduced many years ago, when the antilynching proposal may have been more popular. I do not know whether it was more popular or not, but it was far more justified then than it is now, if it ever was justified, because there were then a few lynchings to complain about.

If we had not had unlimited debate in the United States Senate, an antilynching bill would have passed and become a law which would penalize the taxpayers of a county by requiring them to be taxed and assessed to pay damages whenever a lynching occurred. Of course, Mr. President, that matter is not covered by the motion and the resolution we are discussing; but if the principle of the proposed antilynching bill is to be established by law so far as lynchings are concerned, it should be applied to all other crimes. If that were done, every murder or other heinous crime would be covered by the law, and then why could it not be assumed that the occurrence of the murder or other crime was the fault of the officers, in not enforcing the law? Certainly if the sauce is good for the goose, it should be good for the gander. It may be said, "That fault has been eliminated, so why talk about it?" I am simply showing how the same principle might apply in other cases.

But, Mr. President, why is there all this hubbub about the antilynching bill? Of course, lynching is a form of murder, perhaps in an aggravated form in that it is committed by a mob. Nevertheless, when a man is lynched, he is just as dead as if he had been murdered, and life was just as sweet to him as it is to any other man.

Last year there was only one lynching in the United States, but now we are asked to take all this time in the Senate because of the attempt to have the Senate pass an antilynching bill. Of course, such a bill is unconstitutional. If the Federal Government can pass a law to prevent one lynching, the same Government can pass a law to take jurisdiction over every murder in the country, and should do so. After all, why should there be discrimination so far as murders are concerned? We hear a great deal of talk about discrimination, and some persons say they are trying to prevent discrimination. But the antilynching bill is the rankest and most contemptible discriminatory bill ever to be introduced in the Congress. It singles out only one crime, but absolutely ignores all other crimes of comparable heinousness. Under the provisions of that bill, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, a murder could be committed and the Federal Government would owe nothing to the heirs of the murdered citizen of the United States if a gangster committed the crime. On the other hand, if down South a Negro raped a white man's daughter, and the Negro was lynched, then, under the proposed antilynching law, the Federal Government would owe something to the family of the Negro.

Mr. President, let Senators consider the reports in the daily newspapers. The Negro race has made marvelous progress, but the Congress cannot legislate culture or morals or civilization or progress in the case of any race.

Let me state what this propaganda is doing. The South is not paying for it, but the other sections of the Nation are paying for it. We, in the South, are not having any additional trouble; in fact, we are having less than ever before. But the other sections of the country are paying for this propaganda, for in many cases it is inciting the basest and most bestial instincts ever manifested.

I assume that most Members of the Senate read yesterday's newspapers. I do not wish to refer to the crime referred to, there, or to take the time of the Senate by doing so. I merely point out that while last year there was only one lynching in the South, those who are responsible for the proposed antilynching bill would not have it apply to other forms of murder.

I do not know how many murders were committed in the United States last year, but there were 8,444 in 1946. I understand that there have been more than that in the years since then. In 1946 there were six lynchings. The number of lynchings is decreasing without the benefit of any Federal law, but the murder rate is rising. I do not have the exact figures for the murders committed

in 1947 and 1948, but they are on the increase.

In the same year, 1946, when there were 8,444 murders in the United States and only 6 lynchings, there were 12,117 cases of rape in the United States. Then Mr. President, where is the sincerity back of this proposal? Where is the great interest in humanitarian civil rights? When has the right to protect and preserve the virtue of womanhood ceased to be a human right and a civil right? However, no attempt is being made to have the Federal Government protect the womanhood of America; there is no demand to have such a provision included in the antilynching bill. If such a provision were made a part of it, those who now favor the antilynching bill would not vote for it. Why would they not vote for it? Because in that case the pressure groups would cease their pressure for the enactment of the bill.

The proposed antilynching bill discriminates, because if it were enacted the Federal Government would take over the job of protecting only one phase of human rights. However, if that step were taken, the Government should also undertake to protect the people of the Nation against the commission of all the most heinous crimes, and provision to that effect should be placed in the bill.

Since when has virtue not been sacred and worthy of protection? Some persons prize virtue higher than life itself. Men have died and have given their lives to defend the womanhood of their community and of their families. Yet the agitators for the proposed antilynching law—which would violate the Constitution, and is being proposed simply and solely to add insult to injury upon the section of our Nation which had the Negro imposed on its people in the first place by the profiteers of the North—would not have to live with the problem they would thus create, but we in the South would have to live with it.

Mr. President, I can vouch for practically everything that was said with respect to the relationship of the races by the good lady who wrote the letter which has been referred to. The races are getting along well. There may be some discrimination. There is discrimination with respect to social equality, and there always will be in the hearts of true southerners. But, so far as education is concerned, we are making progress.

Let me remind the Senate that if we have not been able to do all we should have done for the Negro in the South, we have not been able to do all we needed to do for ourselves. After all, the South was a war-torn region, and we were not given much opportunity to make an economic comeback. We have been under economic disadvantages ever since the Civil War. Because of freight rates and many other things, our economic recovery has been tremendously handicapped. Yet, Mr. President, today we are being taxed—by our own acceptance, of course; through their representatives in the Congress, the people of the South are being taxed—to rehabilitate the people of foreign countries and to try to restore their economy and relieve the suffering of those our people have never seen.

After the Civil War the South received no help. There was no FCA; there was no relief program for the South. Instead there was imposed upon the people of the South a carpetbag rule that should never have occurred. It is a blot upon the history of the Nation. We of the South know our problem. Others are learning it, and are going to learn more about it. There are those who keep agitating the race issue. The more they meddle with it, the more it is agitated. The race problem is magnified. There is not so much of a race problem in America as some may think. If those who meddle with it were to stop talking about it and quit agitating it, it would be found to be practically no problem at all. But the agitators keep telling the Negroes they ought to have certain rights and ought to do certain things. The more ideas of that kind are spread, the more news stories there will be such as the one recently in the newspapers.

We of the South know the Negroes. We get along well with them. No relationships can be perfect. It would be better if the problem were left to us and if others would quit meddling with it. I am misleading no one. The problem should be left to those of us who have lived with it and know how to handle it. There are organizations in the metropolitan cities that keep howling for Congress to do something about racial problems. I invite a comparison between such metropolitan areas and the South with respect to the number of heinous crimes committed relative to population. Those who agitate the question are inviting an increase in crime. I realize Senators have heard arguments like this before. It is not pleasant for me to stand here and endeavor to plead with Senators. If I did not believe they needed to know the truth of what I am saying, and if I did not think I knew what I was talking about; further, if I did not think there was some hope of getting the opposition to realize what they are doing before it is too late, I do not know that I would expend the effort, except for the consciousness I have that it is my duty to oppose unconstitutional laws and measures which I think would be detrimental to my country. But if the Congress, and if the majority and minority leadership, were to announce the abandonment or repudiation of the civil rights clap-trap and proceed in an effort to protect the economy of our country, the free-enterprise system that made America great, and endeavor to find a way of establishing peace in the world, enabling us to devote our minds, our wisdom, and our energy to things that are worth while, instead of to things that are destructive, we should be proceeding along the right path. The proposed program is destructive; it is productive of disunity, and it is causing an increase in crime.

It is said that what is proposed is in the interest of protecting human life. An antilynching bill is to be sought in the interest of protecting human life. I say that for every lynching such a bill would prevent, a dozen murders would result. If the message is sent across the land, "The Federal Government has enacted an antilynching bill; it will be down here

to protect you," an idea will be put into the minds of some who now do not dare think of it. Is that what Senators want?

The fruits of such unwisdom are beginning to be seen in the North. That will not be the case in the South. The best thing on earth that could happen to America with respect to the proposed program would be to drop it. It is unfortunate that both political parties, as a sop to voters, endorsed it. It is tragic, to those of us in the South who know how vile it is, and what the penalty will be in exactions upon the harmonious relationship of the races, if the program is enacted. The best thing that could happen would be for both parties to repudiate the whole thing and for the Senate figuratively speaking to kick the whole program into hades and proceed with its legitimate business.

Earlier in my remarks I pointed out the danger to America of the spread of communism throughout the world. I pointed out that that was the real danger to America, not the matter of race relations. There is no danger from that. The relations between the races are improving all the time, but can only be worsened by a program of this sort. My advice is to let the matter alone.

Mr. President, I want to take only a few moments on the FEPC bill. Senators know pretty well what it is designed to do. I have said, and I repeat, these bills are not the end of the program. There are those who would not be satisfied even though all three of the civil-rights bills were enacted. Enactment of the FEPC, if it ever attempted to break down the segregation laws of the country, would be a greater step toward incitement to crime in America than anything else the Congress could do. That is FEPC. I do not know who conceived the idea, but it is not an American concept.

A little earlier today in answer to questions by my colleagues, I endeavored to point out that wherever property rights do not exist and are not respected and recognized by Government, human rights and human liberty do not exist. Is there any government on the face of the earth that recognizes human liberty and freedom and the individual liberty, majesty and dignity of man, that does not also recognize property rights? The right to own property, to create property, to possess and enjoy property, cannot be dissociated from the liberty of the individual. Take that right away from a man and you take away from him the right and the liberty to pursue happiness.

What does the FEPC bill propose to do? Fundamentally it proposes to say to those who own property and who operate a business, "No matter what your pleasure is, no matter what is required to make you happy in your business in operating it as you desire, you cannot do certain things with respect to your own personal comfort and pleasure."

It attempts to say that if one of another race or of another creed, color, or ancestry, applies for a job, the owner of the job—and I say that jobs are property—cannot discriminate by selecting an employee of the race, the color, or the religion he wants.

When did it come to pass in America, Mr. President, that he who creates property, who creates a job in his own right and on his own initiative, with his own capital, his own investment, his own ingenuity, cannot control the situation with reference to whom he will permit to share the benefits, the advantages, and the rewards of the labor involved? It is totalitarianism when the Government can tell the man who creates a thing that he cannot own it or cannot have it except under Government control. If he writes a song or a book, if he creates an invention of usefulness, his Government says that he can get his right protected by copyright or by patent, and no one but him can use it. It is a product of his labor, and he is protected. But now we are asked to break down that structure. The man who creates a job no longer has any protection.

What will happen if FEPC legislation is passed? Thousands of snoopers will be employed. We will tolerate a number of voluntary snoopers who will go around and see if they cannot find some one who has created a job and decided he wanted to employ white people. Then he will be taken somewhere for a hearing, or taken to court, and a cease-and-desist order will be issued against him. The bill provides for establishing I do not know how many commissions and committees. It would establish committees in each community. There will be a great many persons trying to run everyone's business. How much will it cost? I do not know, but if the law is enforced it will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. President, I again emphasize, as I did earlier in my remarks this afternoon, the fact that we had better be appropriating money for devising some means of getting Communist spies out of the Government of the United States, and out of the country. American business people take care of themselves. I do not know anyone who cannot make a living if he wants to work. I do not know anyone who is discriminated against or prevented from going into any kind of business he wants to enter.

I do not want a law which would compel some member of the black race to employ me, certainly not in any confidential or close relationship. It is his right to deny me any job he creates, and I have no right to call on the Federal Government to enact such a totalitarian law, so that a little bureaucrat in Washington, who does not know anything about local conditions, and who cares less, can decide for me whom I can employ and whom I cannot employ. If there were much sincerity about this, many Senators would practice what they preach. I have not seen many persons of another color in Senators' offices. There may be some.

Mr. President, if I were advocating this bill, if I were advocating the enactment of an FEPC bill such as the one proposed, I do not believe I could face a fourth of the population of my State and say, "Although I preach it I do not practice it." Those things have a great deal of weight with me. I simply believe that if it is good under legislation, it is good before legislation is enacted. Those who

advocate the legislation ought to manifest their good faith and their purpose by setting an example of how they think it should work.

Mr. President, I do not know whether it is the purpose of the leadership to continue this evening. I have much more that I wanted to discuss and place in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent at this point that the letter which I placed on the desk and made available to each Senator be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 1949.

DEAR SENATORS: The women of the South, mothers, wives, and daughters of real men, who have fought and died to make this Nation great, are proud of the men, who again are risking their health and lives to preserve the Constitution of the United States, which you, as Senators should also revere. Neither bribery from corrupt politicians nor pressure groups can tempt them to give up their fight, and if you men, supported by the taxpayers of this great Nation, were real men, there would need to be no filibuster to prevent passage of so un-American a bill as the so-called FEPC. The Constitution guarantees to each State the right to levy taxes and make laws necessary for the well-being of its citizens. There is no excuse for the Federal Government attempting to make blanket laws, regulating the lives of all citizens, without respect to the needs of all those citizens. More descendants, counted on a percentage basis of the voting population, of the original founding fathers of this great Nation live below the Mason and Dixon's line than in any section of the Nation. For this reason, we are willing to stand abuse and privations in order to preserve for posterity the freedom of the individual, guaranteed us under the great document the Bill of Rights.

In times so grave as now, you men owe it to the Nation and to the world, to show your power of leadership by working on bills to stop communism in the United States and the world, to help unite the Western Powers for world peace, rather than try to put over on the country a piece of legislation such as the FEPC, which is nothing but tragic discrimination against the whites who have fed, clothed, and nursed the Negroes, when those same southern white people had lost all they owned because of them and hardly had enough to eat themselves. Why didn't the Negroes flock north following the Civil War, when the Federal Government was passing all sorts of discriminatory laws against the South? Care packages, lend-lease, money to rebuild schools, churches and homes destroyed by northern troops in the South were conspicuous by their absence in those days. Even just debts and justified claims of the South were refused payment under section 4 of the XIV amendment to the Constitution, forbidding the payment of the Confederate debt. One reason the Negroes didn't go north was that some of their loving northern brethren, such as Abraham Lincoln, had made it impossible for them to do so. While a member of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln presented a bill preventing Negroes settling in that State.

However, since they have been treated as a political football ever since the northerners collected their money for these human beings they had brought over from Africa, there is little use in appealing to you on political grounds. Had the North never brought slaves and unloaded them on the Southern people, our section would have developed more rapidly. Our mechanized farming would be on a par with that in the Wheat and Corn Belts, had we not known the Negroes had to be housed, fed, doctored, and educated, no matter how little returns we

received, or how little material wealth we started with after the disastrous Civil War. The education of our white children would be on a much more equal basis had we not had, again, this problem of education of the Negroes. We are steadily improving our schools for both races, and if the Federal Government will stop trying to stir up ill-feeling between the two races we will work out all these problems. But here again, most of you are not interested in our economics or educational problems.

Our final appeal is as human beings, and wives and mothers, who are entitled to just as much consideration as you would wish given your own wives and mothers. I received my degree from a northern university, and most of my married life was spent in New York, Detroit, and Baltimore. I know how totally ignorant most of you are of the real problems of southerners who live in communities where the Negroes outnumber us 3 to 1, and in some sections 10 to 1. These are not the clean, ambitious, self-sufficient colored people with whom you are sometimes thrown into contact. These are the indolent, happy-go-lucky people who believe in hoodoo, swap wives or women at will, don't enjoy a church meeting or social gathering unless there is bootleg whisky and a knifing scrape or two. They live in better houses than the log cabins and houses of our white forefathers and have greater facilities for keeping clean, but they go to our health clinics and won't follow the simplest instructions as to health habits and cleanliness. They won't save their money, as they love new clothes, cars, and liquor too well, so when a doctor is needed the white man for whom they work guarantees the bill, whether or not he is ever reimbursed. They work as little as they can, and only go to the cities when they hear of big unemployment checks; for how they love unemployment.

For 3 years I have lived in the country, and northern friends who have visited us cannot understand why I am not terrified to live where I am the only white woman in a radius of 5 miles, with hundreds of Negroes around me. They are our friends, and know we are the best friends they have ever had, but if you men don't wake up and realize what you are doing by all your pointless agitation I don't know how long they will remain friendly. They all have their radios, and hear the biased reports on civil rights. You wouldn't let your little children attend school with these children, drink from the same drinking fountains, and have three out of every five teachers colored. Education in the South will be retarded 50 years or more if nonsegregation is put in schools. Because of interbreeding many of the children are not very bright, yet there would be 10 Negro children to each white child, and of course many of the white children are from rather poorly educated homes, so children from homes such as yours or mine would, of necessity, have to be kept back or neglected in school while those others caught up.

These colored children have very low morals, as a large percentage are illegitimate children of very young unmarried colored girls, and for that reason alone, nonsegregation in such sections would be a tragedy. Perhaps, you think we should send our children to private schools. May I tell you that Southern farmers' incomes would hardly cover that, with high taxes, paying about twice as much for everything we buy, because labor costs have increased so tremendously since the New Deal sold out to unions. Of course, there is the other alternative of selling out, and starting over where we could live in a Northern city in a section where there are no Negroes. That seems rather hard on a disabled veteran of World War I, and our son, a pilot for 3 years in World War II, and a daughter and two other small sons, but it might be possible. It would be absolutely impossible for thousands of less fortunate white families

who have struggled to build up from nothing, their grandparents having lived in abject poverty as a result of the Civil War and World War I.

You are probably working for votes, but we are pleading for our very lives, for a chance to live in peace with a race that through the greed of Northern white men were brought to this section and resulted in one tragic war. They are free to go to other States, if our individual State laws do not please them. Why take away again the freedom of the white man in those States where the white man has borne the burden of the colored race all these years, and at a time when together, we are making progress in health, education, and all ways of life? In the name of all Southern womanhood, of mothers of veterans of past wars, and those wars that may result from your wasting time in causing disunity when we need unity, here and abroad, I plead with you to leave to each State those rights of local self-government as guaranteed to them, and get on with legislation that rightfully belongs to you, and is so needed to make the world safe for our generation, and for generations to come.

#### AN AMERICAN MOTHER FROM THE SOUTH.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since I cannot finish tonight, and since tomorrow I am compelled to leave and cannot be present for the next few days, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 3 days, or until next Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I express the hope that during the time I am compelled to be absent from the Senate there will be no vote on the pending motion, and I hope there will not be any cloture petition filed or a vote taken on any action which may result from such cloture petition, because I want to be present to vote on the question.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

#### SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Llewellyn M. Williams to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be advised of the confirmation at once.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to notify the Members of the Senate that when we recess today we will recess until the usual hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, and there will be another night session on the pending question.

I may add that today we have circulated a petition for cloture to be filed on the motion to take up the pending

measure, which is the amendment to the cloture rule. It now appears that probably sometime tomorrow afternoon the petition for cloture will be filed.

I merely make this announcement in order that Senators may know about it. We must get along with the business of the Senate, and it seems to me that after the length of time that has been spent in debating the issue, the time has now arrived when we must ascertain exactly where we are going with respect to the cloture petition.

I am not saying that what I have suggested will be done tomorrow, but from the number of signatures we have upon the petition for cloture, it seems very probable that we will file it sometime tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the able Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator realizes that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the motion to take up is the pending measure.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that there is quite a difference of opinion as to whether or not the motion to take up is subject to cloture, and no doubt the Senator from Georgia will make the point of order at the proper time.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator stated it was "the pending measure." I did not want to leave the impression that the entire Senate agrees that that is the case.

Mr. LUCAS. It is part of the pending measure, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, in the interpretation of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 21), 1949:

#### SECRETARY, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Llewellyn M. Williams, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whom power and pity blend, who dost give us all things, restrain us from evil impulses and wrongdoing. Create in us new instincts, new desires, new powers of thought and feeling and will. As we stand before a righteous and a just God, may we dare to do the right, conscious that our works do follow us.

Keep in our minds that we are made in Thine image and Thy judgments will ever hold us to a strict accounting for the deeds done this day and every day. O lead us on in the ways of Christian manhood and womanhood, firm in the triumph of faith, the dominion of hope, and the ruggedness of courage. We humbly pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 82):

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Sol Bloom, late a Representative from the State of New York.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

Pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. WAGNER and Mr. IVES were appointed on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes.

#### THE LATE WASHINGTON J. MCCORMICK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal regret that I inform the House this morning of the passing of a former colleague and a predecessor of mine in the House of Representatives. Mrs. Cora Quast McCormick, wife of former Congressman Washington J. McCormick, who represented the First Montana District from 1921 to 1923, called me on the phone yesterday afternoon to tell me of her husband's passing. I know there are very few Members of the House today who served with Washington McCormick, but there are some old-timers who will recall the sterling service which he rendered on behalf of his constituents and the people of the United States as a whole.

Washington McCormick came of a pioneer Montana family. He was born in Missoula, Mont., on January 4, 1884. He attended the public schools in Missoula, the University of Montana, and the University of Notre Dame. He was gradu-

ated from Harvard in 1906. After that he attended the Law Department of Columbia, graduating from there in 1910. He was admitted to the New York bar in 1910, returned to Montana and was admitted to the Montana bar in 1911.

He engaged in the practice of law in the State of Montana. He was a member of the State house of representatives from 1918 to 1920 before being elected to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I wish at this time to extend my most sincere condolences to Mrs. McCormick. We of Montana will miss her husband greatly because of his fine character, and his great contribution to the development of our State.

He was a good man who unselfishly served Montana and the Nation. A captain in the Army of the United States in World War I, he served his country in an industrial capacity in World War II. Only age kept him out of the armed forces in the late struggle but even that could not stop him from doing his share wherever and whenever he found the opportunity to do so.

Yes, Washington J. McCormick is gone from among us. But, the accomplishments which were his remain and the memories of his friendship will linger long after his body is laid to rest. His frankness, humor, and sagacity have endeared him to us and we will think of him lovingly in the years ahead.

May his soul rest in peace.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the *Journal of Commerce*, New York, under date of March 8, 1949, relative to keeping the FDIC an independent agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Brown of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a statement relative to the Calumet-Sag Channel.

Mr. GRANAHAH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an article appearing in the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances and include letters and articles.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit while general debate is in progress during today's session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit while general debate is in progress during today's session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNIST TRIALS

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Holy Name Society of the Buffalo diocese and an editorial appearing in the *New York Times*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it is just 1 month today that I stood in the well of the House to protest the infamous trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. At the time I said it was not so much that it was a high dignity of the Catholic Church that was being prosecuted and persecuted; it could have been some dignity of some other denominational faith. That has now come to pass where the Communist-controlled Government of Bulgaria has arrested ruthlessly 15 ministers of the Protestant denominations and sentenced these men. I am raising my voice in protest here at this ruthless war on religious freedom by these satellite nations. Certainly this House of Representatives should take some action in voicing its protest against all these infamous trials.

Reports from reliable sources indicate that these ministers were ruthlessly arrested, incarcerated, drugged, and tortured so they would confess to things in which they had not participated.

This is a campaign on the part of anti-religious forces to destroy religion and religious freedom not only in these Communist-controlled countries of Europe, but throughout the world. Certainly then, these antireligious forces are not only on the rampage to destroy religion and religious freedom but to destroy democratic nations throughout the world.

This apparently is their program and it remains for us, a democratic nation, believing in the great principles of freedom of religion, speech, the press, and

all other freedoms to become alert to this great menace that exists and to combat it by asking the President of the United States and the State Department to file a strong formal protest with these Communist-controlled governments, which are carrying on this vicious campaign to destroy religion and the freedoms of all peoples, and to invoke economic sanctions if possible.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial from the *Boston Traveler*, advocating a reduction in excise taxes.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a letter from Dr. Raver, the Bonneville Power Administrator.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* on the Missouri Valley Authority, and further to extend his remarks and include a survey on the closed shop by Rogers Dunn.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a letter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a statement by David Lawrence on the subject Nonstop B-50 Flight Demonstrates Need for a Big Army and Navy.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances, and to include in one a speech by Henry J. Taylor over the radio entitled "Keep Uncle Sam Solvent," together with questions sent him by mail and his answers, and in the other an article entitled "Mr. Farmer, the Wage Law Hits You Too!—Aimed at the Factories It Goes Through to the Farms!" I do not know who the author is but I certainly approve what the gentleman who wrote it says.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### NAVY VESSELS LOANED TO RUSSIA

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from former Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, we were all pleased to learn that after 5 years under the Red flag of Russia, the U. S. S. light cruiser *Milwaukee* is back under the American flag again.

If that ship could talk, I wonder what it would have to say about life under the hammer and sickle.

The question the administration should now answer for the American

public, is: When will the other 580 Navy vessels we loaned to Russia be returned?

That the Members may have readily available a list of the ships we turned over to Russia, there is quoted below a letter from then Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, dated April 30, 1947, in which 581 ships are listed, together with the dates on which they were turned over to Russian custody:

Type	Number	Dates
AG (river tugs)	15	Aug. 21, 1944 through Apr. 11, 1945.
AM (mine sweepers)	34	June 25, 1943 through Aug. 17, 1945.
LCIL (landing craft, infantry)	30	June 10, 1945 through July 29, 1945.
PF (frigate)	28	July 13, 1945 through Sept. 4, 1945.
SC (submarine chasers, 110-foot)	78	July 13, 1943 through Sept. 2, 1945.
BPT (motor torpedo boat)	8	Feb. 8, 1944 through Feb. 16, 1945.
LCT (landing craft, tank)	17	Apr. 15, 1945 through May 26, 1945.
PT (motor torpedo boat)	194	Feb. 15, 1943 through Aug. 30, 1945.
YMS (motor mine sweepers)	43	Mar. 31, 1945 through Sept. 2, 1945.
YR (floating workshops)	4	June 19, 1945 through July 29, 1945.
PTC (submarine chasers)	26	Dec. 8, 1943 through Aug. 13, 1944.
LCM (3) (land craft, mechanized)	54	June 7, 1943 through Dec. 30, 1944.
RPC (submarine chasers)	36	Dec. 3, 1943 through Mar. 4, 1944.
Motor launch	1	Oct. 19, 1944.
Plane personnel boat	1	Mar. 15, 1945.
LCS (S) (landing craft, support)	2	Dec. 30, 1944.
LCPV (landing craft, vehicle and personnel)	2	Do.
CR (ice breaker)	3	Feb. 25, 1944 through Mar. 24, 1945.
250-ton pontoon barges	4	Jan. 10, 1945 through Oct. 15, 1945.
CL (light cruiser)	1	Apr. 20, 1944.

With exception of the light cruiser (formerly the U. S. S. *Milwaukee*) all the above-listed craft are subject to return to the United States not later than the termination of the present wars. The light cruiser is on loan to the U. S. S. R. and is subject to return upon implementation of the terms of the Italian peace treaty.

Very truly yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Let us hope they come back to us soon, and in condition so they can rejoin their sister ships under the Stars and Stripes.

#### MINORITY VIEWS ON RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to file minority views on the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the rent-control bill. I have some facts which I should like the House to consider as we approach this difficult problem.

At least 2,850,000 apartments and other rental-housing units have been added to the Nation's nonfarm housing supply since 1940. Melvin H. Baker, chairman of the Construction Industry Information Committee, stated Saturday.

Nevertheless, there are now 760,000 fewer rental units and 4,600,000 fewer persons living in rental accommodations than in 1940, because in the 9 years more than 3,000,000 units, mostly single-family houses, have

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, April 30, 1947.  
Hon ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: As requested in your letter of April 17, 1947, the following is a list, by type, of ships, boats, barges, and/or floating drydocks of the Navy transferred to the U. S. S. R., together with inclusive dates on which transfer was made:

been purchased for occupancy by new owners and thus have left the rental supply.

This unprecedented reduction in the number of rental units is attributed principally to the fact that many owners preferred to sell their properties rather than continue to operate them under rent controls.

This trend is a reversal of the customary pattern of the past, by which older single-family dwellings were frequently transferred from owner-occupancy to rental use.

Of the 2,850,000 rental units added to our supply since 1940, about 1,500,000 units have been created by remodeling of existing structures to provide additional units. About 750,000 units were provided with public funds in the war and postwar emergency housing programs, and 600,000 units were in new rental construction financed with private funds.

This decade has been the greatest period of housing production ever known, surpassing even the former all-time record years of the 1920's. But, in contrast, privately financed new rental construction has been at the rate of less than 70,000 units a year, compared with 350,000 units a year from 1923 to 1927.

The decline of rental units in the face of our tremendous total residential production is an abnormal and unprecedented situation.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object; would the distinguished majority leader inform us as to the program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill is the first order of business today. Then there are the several bills which were on the program for yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the appropriation bill comes first?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and I am hopeful that we can dispose of that program today because I understand there is not much opposition to any of the bills, or at least that is my information. In any event the rent-control bill will come up tomorrow for general debate and will be continued under the 5-minute rule on Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There being 5 hours' general debate, we will consume about 6 hours on that tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there will be 1 hour on the rule; I suppose my distinguished friend has that in mind. If the bill is not disposed of on Friday, I will be constrained, however reluctantly, to go into a Saturday session. If the bill is disposed of on Friday, then we will adjourn over until Monday. Tomorrow I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts about coming in Friday at 11 o'clock to take the bill up under the 5-minute rule. I always like to adjourn from Friday to Monday whenever it is possible and the House has always co-operated whenever there has been such a full program, because the Members are exceedingly busy in their offices, and it gives them an opportunity to catch up with their mail and performing the many other duties in the performance of their work.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to meeting on Saturday if it is necessary.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made that statement because it is necessary that the rent bill be disposed of, and I hope it will be disposed of by Friday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is being done to cut down on these appropriation bills that are coming up, so that the taxpayers of this country can get some relief from the great burdens that are being imposed upon them?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend is a very prominent and powerful Member when it comes to appropriations.

Mr. RICH. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. They would not have me on that committee because if I were a member of it I would cut the heart out of some of these appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related

independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3333, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual appropriation bill for fiscal year 1950 for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

First, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the subcommittee. In the 9 years I have been a Member of this honorable body I have yet to see a committee that has been more diligent than this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

We held hearings on the bill for several weeks, and there was seldom a time when a single member of the subcommittee was absent.

I pay particular tribute to my colleagues on the Democratic side, the able gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, and the able gentleman from New York, Judge McGRATH, for the valuable assistance they gave me during these weeks of hearings.

I want also to pay tribute to the members of the minority, including the former chairman of this subcommittee and ranking member on the minority side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], for the support and cooperation they gave to me while these hearings were in progress.

I would like to pay special tribute to our very able and conscientious clerk, Paul Wilson, who we were so fortunate to have as clerk for this committee. Without his help and support we would not have been able to report this bill today. He has been a monument of strength to every member of the committee in helping us to bring this appropriation bill to the floor today.

This is a very difficult and complex bill. In my opinion, it is one of the most important appropriation bills that will come before this House this year. It embraces many and varied programs. I am very happy to say that the mem-

bership of this committee, although we may disagree on some items in the bill, are generally in agreement. Some of the members felt that some appropriations should have been increased more than the Bureau of the Budget allowed, and we have done that in three or four instances. Some of us might have felt that some of the increases that we have allowed should have been in lesser amounts. Some of the members may feel that some of the requests that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget should have been decreased, but in the over-all, I think I can safely say that we are fairly well in agreement on the the recommendations in this bill.

The bill carries total direct appropriations of \$2,211,794,085, which is an increase of \$353,838,775 over what has been appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 to date, but is a reduction of \$23,271,600 under the Budget estimates. The increase over 1949 appropriations to date does not take account of substantial additional funds now pending in the first deficiency bill. I hope you will follow the report as we go along in this discussion, because it is a very comprehensive and well-prepared report that explains and covers practically every item in the bill, and shows in detail comparisons with the estimates and the current year.

The first portion of the bill relates to the Labor Department itself. On page 42 of the report there is a breakdown of the appropriations for the Labor Department, and you will notice in the last column a decrease in the amount of \$216,200. This represents a supplemental request sent up for the International Labor Affairs Office after we had concluded regular hearings on the bill. Although we held hearings for part of a day on this supplemental item, we did not feel we had sufficient knowledge to determine whether or not this was necessary at this time, and thus to justify granting it without further consideration, and so we have excluded it from the bill. But in all the other items for the Department of Labor we have recommended the full amount allowed by the Budget. In total, the Department has available this year, fiscal year 1949, \$14,373,150, and we are allowing them for fiscal 1950, \$16,550,000, or an increase of \$2,176,850 over what they had for fiscal year 1949. About \$991,000 of that increase is for Public Law 900 pay-raise costs.

The largest single increase in the bill for the Department of Labor is for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$1,441,452; and the largest item in that increase is for the collection of statistics on employment, hours, and earnings, on a State basis, and for selected industries, which will be a very comprehensive program in the future. It is supposed to eliminate duplication of collection of statistics from employers as has happened on occasion in the past. It will in effect permit the sending of but one form to an employer for reporting all these statistics, whereas in the past the employers have been bothered by having to fill out several forms. So it is our hope that by the inclusion of this item we will eliminate

a duplication that has been going on in the past in the matter of the collection of important statistics on employment, hours, earnings, and so forth, by or through the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The increase also includes additional funds for strengthening the whole-sale-price index and the cost-of-living index which have such wide usage. It will also provide for needed building construction statistics which are not available at the present time. We hope that with this and the other items of appropriation the Department of Labor will be more able to function as a real department next year.

My statement that this is a very difficult and complex bill is borne out by the portion dealing with the Federal Security Agency. For this Agency alone the budget estimates of direct appropriations are \$1,501,481,985. Of that amount \$1,372,655,260, or 91½ percent, represents items, which, for the most part, we cannot touch. In other words we cannot materially reduce the expenditures involved in these items which include grants and benefits to States and others of various kinds. Many of the amounts represent mandatory grants as, for example, the public-assistance grants which for the first time in history has reached a total of \$1,058,000,000. For vocational rehabilitation there is \$20,500,000. The unemployment-compensation and employment services grants are \$135,000,000 in cash. For vocational education, \$19,842,760. The Employees' Compensation Bureau, \$13,000,000. The Children's Bureau receives annually for grants to the States, \$22,000,000. The Public Health Service estimate of grants is \$88,653,000. Another general category is for hospitals that we have to appropriate for, which are mainly marine hospitals, and the estimates of total appropriation for them are \$29,519,789, or 2 percent of the over-all Federal security figure. In order to operate the educational institutions it takes \$2,650,000, or two-tenths of 1 percent.

The construction program at Howard University, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and at Bethesda, Md., that we have embarked upon in the past 3 or 4 years included in this bill is mostly for past contract authorizations and the estimates for those are \$25,928,425, or 1.7 percent of the over-all bill.

So, all in all, in the Federal Security appropriations that we have before us today, involving estimates of about \$1,500,000,000, 95.4 percent represents items in which we could not show substantial savings; we have made reductions, however, wherever we could. We only have 4.6 percent of that sum, or about \$69,000,000, to operate on and in which to make other cuts. We have made cuts wherever we felt justified in doing so under all the circumstances.

As I say, we have cut some of the items in the Federal Security Agency, but there are three notable exceptions where we have gone beyond the figures allowed by the Bureau of the Budget in the Public Health Service. On those three items the committee is unanimous in its decision, feeling that the Bureau of the Budget did not know of or perhaps fully appreciate the program that had been

started by this committee in the past 2 or 3 years and has been followed through by this committee when the Bureau of the Budget cut the request of the Public Health Service for mental-health activities, for cancer activities, and an appropriation for the National Heart Institute.

Those of you who were here a year ago will remember that this committee took the same type of action at that time under the leadership of the then chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who has been very active in this entire program in the past. At that time we went over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget in providing funds for mental-health activities, for the National Cancer Institute, and approved substantial amounts for the National Heart Institute. The latter program was given added emphasis a year ago with the passage of the National Heart Act in June 1948, by the Eightieth Congress.

As I think everyone knows, when the public-health officials appear before committees of Congress, they are obliged to justify and support the budget figures, and are not allowed to justify anything over the budget; but because of the intense interest of this committee in these three programs—mental health, heart, and cancer—it was the unanimous decision of the committee to call in some of the outstanding men in those three fields in the country. So, as a result, after consultation with the Surgeon General, we set aside 2 days of hearings to have some of these outstanding men come in and testify and give us the benefit of their experience in these fields, to see what we could do to hold these programs started a year or two ago.

These men in the mental-health field included men like Dr. Menninger, of Kansas, eminently qualified in that field; also Dr. Paul White in the heart field; and in the cancer field we had Dr. Rhoades of Memorial Hospital, N. Y., who is considered one of the outstanding men on cancer in the world today. There were others before the committee. I know, if you will read the hearings and read our report and read the testimony of these and other outstanding people who appeared before the committee, that everyone of you would be willing to vote for more than we are allowing in the bill today for these three very important programs at the present time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to commend the committee for its splendid action. I think it is a good step. I wanted to voice my approval now as well as later.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I, too approve of what the committee has done. At Ohio State University, in Columbus, Ohio, the State has made substantial appropriations for increasing the medical center, and it was hoped that there could be a construction program amounting to \$1,500,000 in con-

nection with cancer research. I note that that item was presented by Dr. Heller, and I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how much of that program could be carried out under the \$2,500,000 additional granted by the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I recall the testimony, the National Advisory Cancer Council had cleared, or had ready for clearance, about 17 projects at a cost of about \$8,688,000. We are now recommending only \$2,500,000, and it would be up to the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General to decide where the \$2,500,000 will be allocated as regards specific projects cleared by the Council.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will recall, when the matter was under discussion before the committee, that Dr. Heller listed a number of projects which they considered to be of high priority in the construction of facilities for cancer research. They totaled about \$8,600,000, as I recall. The gentleman will also recall, I believe, that Dr. Heller testified that the National Advisory Cancer Council had not yet approved any of those projects because there were no funds presently available. What actually happened was, we have today in this bill \$2,500,000 for construction funds, and, as the gentleman from Rhode Island has stated, the National Advisory Cancer Council will determine the allocation of those funds to the projects for which applications are now pending.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I find, on page 20 of the report, a statement that—

The \$2,500,000 allocated for construction grants is firm. It is desired that the amounts for the other projects be allocated approximately as shown, but the committee wishes to point out that it has no intention or desire to so firmly earmark the breakdown as to require utilization of total resources contrary to the considered judgment of the Surgeon General based upon recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council.

Now, do I understand by that that if the committee has no intention to finally earmark funds, it has the intention that these funds shall be used as the National Advisory Cancer Council shall deem best, and not require spending a little on all of the projects, but permit them to pick specific projects if that is deemed the best way to meet the problem?

Mr. FOGARTY. I presume that will be what they will do. The reason we earmarked the \$2,500,000 as a firm item is to make sure that that amount goes into construction grants and not go anywhere else; that they allocated it for that purpose.

Mr. VORYS. It is the intention of the committee to make it firm for construction, but not to require that it be allocated for any specific project or any specific lists of projects?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; we are not attempting to tell them where to spend the money. We are leaving that up to the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General. We have the utmost faith in that Council and the decisions that have

been made by them and by the Surgeon General.

If you will refer to the report on these activities, starting on page 16 of the committee report, you will see the breakdowns we have allowed for the mental-health activities and cancer and heart research. At the bottom of page 16 you will see a table relating to funds for mental-health activities. We have allowed, in total appropriated funds for 1950, \$825,000 more than was allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the mental-health activities, and have allowed \$2,010,000 more in contract authority for research—grants—and training—graduate and undergraduate—than the Bureau of the Budget allowed for contract authority in connection with mental-health activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It was testified before the committee that the mental-health problem is one of the most serious problems we have to face in this country today. It was testified that about 50 percent of the hospital beds are occupied today by mentally ill patients. It was further testified that 8,500,000 people are mentally ill in this country at the present time.

I think if some of you had an opportunity to visit some State asylum run by the various States throughout this country, you would be shocked at the treatment that is being given in some States to their mentally ill. I, for one, firmly believe that something can be done to ease this situation. It is going to take time; it is going to take money; and it is going to take trained personnel. We are attempting in this bill to provide funds in the years to come, not only this year, to get the trained technicians, scientists, and other personnel we need at the present time and in the future to attempt to find out the causes of mental illness. Until we do find the causes, there is not much we can do about it. But I think when 50 percent of the hospital beds in this country are occupied today by mentally ill patients, it is about time the Federal Government took a definite step forward in attempting to find a solution to the problem of the causes of mental illness.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I asked the gentleman to yield simply so I could express a very sincere appreciation for the work the subcommittee has done on the mental-health program. I am the author of the mental-health act that passed this House a few years ago. I have watched the beginnings of that program, and have been encouraged by some of the work that has been done. I appreciate the attitude of the subcommittee in providing funds that this work may be expanded, and I say this because it is a very sincere appreciation out of the depths of my heart.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

On page 19 of the report you will find a similar break-down for the funds of the National Cancer Institute. Here again

we have exceeded the figures that were given to us by the Bureau of the Budget by \$4,400,000. The Bureau of the Budget requested \$16,100,000 in appropriation. That request was increased \$300,000. Because this is a program that has been started and implemented by this committee and the Congress in the past few years, we believe it is a going program and we have allowed the full amount which was requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Cancer Institute and increased the appropriated funds by \$300,000. A year ago \$8,000,000 was approved by the Congress for contract authority for cancer research construction grants. This year the Bureau of the Budget only allowed \$900,000 for forward financing research projects. We have exceeded the figure by \$4,100,000 in this field because we have made up our minds to keep this program going forward and not allow it to slip backward.

It was testified in the committee that one out of seven are dying of cancer in this country at the present time. It is the second leading cause of death. Some cases of cancer which were incurable a few years ago are being cured today because of the research that has been going on during the past 3 or 4 years. Unless we keep up that program; unless we allow contract authority for forward planning and graduate work in these schools, and for research facilities, so that we can get the proper men in this field and provide them with the facilities, we are not going to get properly trained people in this field of cancer or make progress like we should. There are hundreds and hundreds of men today who are putting their lives into this field of cancer research. If we can give them some encouragement, we believe that we can go a long, long way. That is why we have exceeded the budget by \$4,400,000, over-all.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am very much impelled to thank the gentleman for the magnificent work that his committee has done in this aspect of the budget. There is nothing that can contribute more for the encouragement of those who are working so desperately in this research field than this program of forward payment, and the refusal to submit to a cut. Those of us who have not had the privilege of working with you thank you for the work that you have done.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to the gentlewoman that this is not my program. This is the program of the entire Committee on Appropriations. They were unanimously in favor of this program, which was started before I became a member of the committee and which I am happy to play a part in now. Every member of the committee deserves credit for this program, because they have been unanimously in favor of it.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I realize, of course, that the full committee had to pass on this program, but I do appreciate so much that the subcommittee went to bat for it.

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 20 you will find the same break-down for the fund

for the National Heart Institute. It is a relatively new program which has been implemented by the passage of the National Heart Act of 1948. We have increased the budget estimate for the National Heart Institute in appropriated funds by \$3,725,000, and in contract authority by \$3,220,000, or a total of \$6,945,000.

This is practically a new program. But after listening to the testimony of outstanding men in this field, we were convinced that it is one of the most necessary programs that the Federal Government can support at the present time. I believe the Members of Congress and the members of the committee today could never find any fault with this subcommittee in going over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget, especially in view of what has happened within the last 4 or 5 days when we have lost three outstanding men in this country, one a Member of this body, another a Member of the Senate, and the third a former Member of this House, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Andrews, of New York. Those three men have passed away in the last 4 or 5 days by sudden heart attacks. I know there are those in this Congress who will say, "What can we do about it?" That has been one of my complaints in the past. There are too many who seem to take that attitude, that if you have heart trouble there is not anything to do about it except to go home and go to bed. After listening to some of the men in this field, we are convinced that something can be done about it, if we provide the necessary funds to establish various clinics, to establish a way to get trained personnel in this field, and to establish proper research facilities throughout the country. That is the principal reason why we have gone over the figures of the Bureau of the Budget in this item. The No. 1 killer of our people today is heart disease. While we have been appropriating money in past years, year in and year out, for the Public Health Service for preventive diseases, like venereal disease, tuberculosis, and others, they have found new drugs to help in the cure of those diseases. But at the same time not much had been done about heart disease. Where we have found drugs that help in these preventive diseases, the record shows the cause of death by those diseases is going down year after year, but in the case of death by heart disease, the record shows an increase in the past 10 years. Instead of leveling off we are going higher and higher and higher. I think something should be done about it.

This Congress has appropriated in the neighborhood, as I recall, of \$25,000,000 a year, or at least we did last year, to try to find out something about the hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

This Congress has appropriated over \$25,000,000 for research in the hoof-and-mouth disease. That is a good program, and I am for it. I voted for it. I think it is necessary. But I think if we can do

something like that we can at least not only take care of the animal industry of the country but also the human beings of this country, in an attempt to try to find out some way whereby they can have a longer and healthier life.

We are spending in the neighborhood of \$9,000,000 for Bang's disease in cattle. We are spending millions of dollars to find out what diseases affect plants and trees. I think it is about time we gave serious consideration to the ailments affecting you and me and every other human being in the country, and we are attempting to do something about it in this bill.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I would like to join with my colleagues in commending the committee for the forward approach and the great vision they have taken in bringing forward this very comprehensive piece of legislation. In thinking about what you are spending for hoof-and-mouth disease, I am reminded that we are spending today approximately 34 cents out of every dollar paying for past wars and preparing for future wars. It seems to me we need to begin to emphasize these great social problems involving the health and education of our people. I wish to highly commend the committee for its forward approach in coming to grips with this important subject.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would like to join in the statements made by my colleague, and to commend the committee for the appropriation act which it has produced. Like the committee, I believe the greatest natural resource which our country has is the men and women who make up this country. The millions which we are spending to save our mineral resources, forests, and other resources are very essential to the national welfare, but the funds which this committee has appropriated will do much to check and eradicate the dread scourges which are killing and crippling so many of our people. These appropriations truly recognize the need for protecting and preserving our greatest natural resource, and I am happy to support them.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is one other major change in this appropriation bill to which I shall address myself and that is the appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security for the fiscal year 1950. I think, as perhaps most of the Members know, the funds for the employment security programs in the States have not been sufficient for this fiscal year and that the Members perhaps have received many requests from the administrators of employment security in the various States for additional funds to be granted to them in this bill. As I remember the figures of a year ago the Bureau of Employment Security requested of the Bureau of the Budget \$160,000,000 for fiscal year 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut that request by about \$15,000,000, that is, cut it down to \$145,000,000 plus; this House cut that

request to \$123,000,000, or a further decrease of \$22,000,000; and we finally came out of conference with the sum of \$130,000,000 for the State employment security programs.

The estimate of \$135,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 was based on work loads which it now appears certain are outdated. All of us know that unemployment has risen since last November or December, although I believe it is leveling off at the present time. I will not, however, admit that the unemployment situation today is anything to get alarmed about after reading the report of the Bureau of the Census released last week. A year ago, in February of 1948, we had employed in this country 57,200,000 people; in February of 1949, according to the figures of the Census, we had the same number of people employed, 57,200,000; but during the year 600,000 new employable people came into the labor market with no increase in available jobs; so, as a result, we have about 600,000 more unemployed today than we had a year ago, but we have exactly the same number of people employed today that we had in February of 1948.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman how this money is allocated to the States: Is it allocated on the case load of the State? The reason I ask the question of the gentleman is that in Massachusetts last year we asked for a million more than we got. The consequence was that in October we had to lay off workers and could not take care of the work load thrust upon us. According to this report, the matter of allocation is left to somebody who does not make a proper allocation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would not say that. The decision is left to the Director of the Employment Security Bureau, Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, who makes the various allotments. The first step is for the State to submit to the Bureau of Employment Security here in Washington a budget of what it thinks it is going to need in the next year. We all know there are indeterminate factors that cannot be foreseen with accuracy, such as the increase of the work load or the increase of unemployment; but the States make their budget and their budget is sent to Washington to be passed on by the Bureau of Employment Security. It then goes to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget determines what shall be submitted for the next year. For the coming fiscal year 1950 the Bureau of Employment Security requested \$159,000,000 plus for this purpose; the Bureau of the Budget cut that request to \$135,000,000, only \$5,000,000 above what the Congress allowed them originally for 1949. In 1949 they were allowed \$130,000,000. By recent action of this House in a deficiency bill they received an additional \$10,000,000; so that, presumably, they will have available in 1949 at least \$140,000,000 instead of the original \$130,000,000.

Now, to get back to the gentleman's question, I think the committee has arrived at a common-sense solution of the

over-all problem, and if the gentleman will let me proceed for just a couple of minutes, maybe I can clarify some of the things he has in mind. We of the committee realize how difficult it is to forecast in the future what the unemployment-compensation work load is going to be in any particular State. We realize the problem that the chief of the department has in making allotments to the various States under the budget that they request. We also realize that when some States were ordered a year ago to cut down because of lack of funds from the administrative level here in Washington, they refused to cut down and take off employees at the State level, and certain difficulties arose. That has been the fault of the State in two or three instances. Every State in the Union has run short of funds and has had to lay off help in their local offices. So, this year we are attempting to do something in this bill that will help straighten out the difficulties that were experienced in connection with the deficiencies experienced last year.

A year ago it was recommended that we establish a contingency fund of 10 percent of the base appropriation. If we had done that a year ago, we would have had a contingency fund of \$13,000,000 to be used in the fiscal year 1949 to take care of this unforeseen increase in the work load that exists at the present time. We did not do that. So this year in order to overcome the situation, as we see it, we are appropriating the amount that has been allowed by the Bureau of the Budget, \$135,000,000, but we have added certain language, and if you will look on page 25 of the report, you will see the language we have added to the bill, as follows:

*Provided, That during the period ending March 31, 1950, this appropriation may be apportioned and obligated at an annual rate not in excess of \$150,000,000 and, to the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, such annual rate may be increased to not in excess of \$157,500,000:*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, that means, as the report explains, that they can spend in the first three-quarters of the fiscal year 1950 at an annual rate of not to exceed \$150,000,000. If this work load keeps up as it is at present they might have to spend the \$150,000,000. If they do they will have to come in for another deficiency to this Congress next spring. I do not believe the rate is going to hold up that way. In my opinion, this is an unusual situation we are in at the present time. The unemployment situation is not going to continue as it is at the present time.

Also a year ago we wanted to establish some sort of a contingency fund to offset certain of these increases in State salaries that we could not foresee and

that the State people and Federal security could not foresee. So we have set out in the language of the bill, "To the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds it necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the number of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, such annual rate may be increased to not in excess of \$157,500,000."

This means that we are establishing a contingency reserve of 5 percent of the basic maximum annual rate of \$150,000,000, or \$7,500,000, that can be used for those purposes, if need be, under the conditions stated.

We have high hopes that in the near future after this contingency fund has had a chance to work we will eliminate the need for coming back to the Congress each time for a deficiency. Another thing we will be doing by granting this contingency fund is this: In the past the Employment Security Director has been able to make these grants on only a semi-annual basis. The State people have found fault with that, and I think they have had some reason to find fault with it, but we have the assurance of Mr. Goodwin, Director of Employment Security, that if they are granted a contingency fund he will be able to allocate the funds on a yearly basis in the coming year; therefore I think that this is a common-sense approach to the over-all problem, which is very difficult to determine on a realistic dollar basis so far in advance as we normally have to do in this Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With those increased provisions which go beyond anything ever provided for, if I understand the gentleman, the States then will have to submit their budgets to the headquarters down here and then let the headquarters here work out through contingency funds and such additional appropriations as the Congress might make, to meet the load that may develop. That is what the program would be.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have talked much longer than I anticipated on this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. My people in Texas, who are responsible for the administration of the George-Barden Act, have indicated that they were very short of money this last year, yet in the hearings, on page 110, it shows there was approximately \$1,000,000 unexpended under this act. Does that mean that the \$1,000,000 of the approximately \$19,000,000 that was appropriated was not used?

Mr. FOGARTY. The total for fiscal 1948 was mentioned in the hearings. I do not recall the precise amount.

Mr. TEAGUE. It shows Texas has an unexpended balance of about \$28,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know the total offhand, but there were some funds in the various States that were not used by the States. That is a matching fund item, and I would say that that would be the answer. But, we have had several requests for increasing this appropriation which is authorized by law to go up to \$29,301,000 plus. There are a lot of things in this bill on which we would like to go over the budget request but we have to stop somewhere. So, we have allowed only the same that they had last year for the George-Barden program.

We have one new appropriation in the bill, for the water pollution program, and we have allowed practically what the Bureau of the Budget called for. There is \$1,000,000 in grants to States. They asked for \$1,380,000 for Public Health Service salaries and expenses, and we have reduced that by \$380,000. But, we have been assured that this program authorized a year ago will not be hurt in any way by that reduction.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is perhaps the ninth time that I have appeared in the well of the House to discuss this particular appropriation. I elected to stay upon this particular subcommittee because I love the work. I want to say that in all the years that I have been upon this subcommittee I never have appreciated or enjoyed it more than this year. It has been a delightful experience to see such unanimity of thinking on the part of the members of this committee, and such a splendid approach manifested by the three new members of the committee who have taken such a great interest in the welfare of this country as evidenced in the appropriations made under this bill. I want to thank the chairman for his uniform fairness and courtesy. I have tried to be of such help as I could in aiding in the conduct of these hearings, in order that the Members would have the information at hand on the subjects with which this bill deals.

I want the House to know that both the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HERRICK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] have shown great interest and have made every effort to understand the very complicated appropriation items that are contained in this bill. I feel tremendously relieved to have as one of the minority members of this committee the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who always, out of his very clear thinking and his good mind, puts his finger exactly on the point at issue and is at all times trying to see if it is not possible to reduce appropriations and expenditures of money to ease the tax burden upon the people of America.

We are confronted with a peculiar situation and always have been under this bill. Just think of it: The little appropriation that is required to maintain the Department of Labor is puny and infinitesimal compared with the amounts we appropriate for the Federal Security Agency. The Venereal Disease Control Division of the Public Health Service alone spends more money than the entire

Department of Labor in its activities. I use that just as an illustration to show the situation with which we are confronted in this bill.

In this bill you have the appropriation for railroad retirement. The law states that the railroad workers and the carriers shall contribute into the Public Treasury for the maintenance of the railroad retirement program, and we have to appropriate that money to them and have nothing to say about it. The law requires it to be done. It runs into hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars.

You have all the appropriations for the Bureau of Public Assistance, that matches the State funds in the grants under the social-security law, for old-age assistance, for maternal and child-welfare aid, for aid to crippled children, and for aid to the blind. This year for the first time in the history of this Congress the amount of Federal aid for matching funds under the various titles of the Social Security Act reached the astounding total of \$1,058,000,000.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. On the very point the gentleman is discussing, public assistance, it is stated on page 32 of the bill that the appropriation is for grants to States for old-age assistance and dependent children. I do not find any place, either in the report of the committee or the hearings, where any of these States repay to the Federal Government any portion of the grant they receive. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KEEFE. What does the gentleman mean, repay it to the Federal Government?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. They do not pay back to the Federal Government any portion of any grant they receive.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course; it is a matching-fund program. They do not pay it back.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I wonder whether the committee knows that there are States that receive this grant, but, when a citizen applies for old-age assistance or for aid to dependent children, the State requires the signing of a restitution bond or agreement, and upon the death of the recipient of the old-age assistance the State levies against the estate and collects that money back, but does not account to the Federal Government for any portion of the money it collects.

Mr. KEEFE. I say to the gentleman that he is entirely in error with respect to that. That is not a fact. I have gone into that question at length, year after year, and it is a fact that is pretty well known, that the Federal Government does not require, in the administration of social security, that any State law shall require liens against the homes of beneficiaries. That is entirely a matter of State law.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. But when an old-age pensioner, for example, who lived in a State which requires a lien to be filed against his or her home, dies, and the State takes that property over and sells it in order to realize a benefit under their

lien and to recover the amount of money that has been paid, the Federal Government shares in the distribution of those funds just as the State does.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Does the report show where the Government does receive the benefits? I have not been able to find it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman can take that matter up with the Social Security Administration. I do not know whether it is shown this year in the tables, but it has been shown year after year. You will find out the exact amount that comes back to the Federal Government as its share of the recoveries under such social-security legislation. I know that is a fact, because I have gone into it. The matter has been raised time and time again in years past.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Referring to the \$1,058,000,000 set forth on page 52 of the report and the \$715,889,000 on the Railroad Retirement Agency on page 53 of the committee report, as I understand it, the Congress appropriated those funds. Was the \$715,889,000 paid into the Federal Treasury by the railroads and the railroad employees?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was paid in?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Likewise, what portion of the \$1,058,000,000 was paid in under social security? What portion of that was paid into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. KEEFE. None of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. None of it?

Mr. KEEFE. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the \$1,058,000,000 is a direct appropriation and a burden on the taxpayers?

Mr. KEEFE. The \$1,058,000,000 is a direct burden on the Treasury of the United States to provide matching funds under the social-security law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. While the \$715,889,000 is an indirect burden paid in by the railroads and their employees?

Mr. KEEFE. That would fall in the same category as the appropriation for old-age and survivors' insurance. Under that program, the employee pays into the Treasury 1 percent of his wage and the employer pays in 1 percent of the pay roll. The total thus paid into the Treasury is then appropriated to the trust fund of the OASI. It falls in the same category. There is nothing that can be done about it. It has to be done under the law. What I am leading to with reference to that point and what I am trying to demonstrate, as I have in years past, is that people come in and say, "Here is a bill covering two-billion-two-hundred-and-thirty-million-odd dollars. That is a lot of money. Why do you not cut these appropriations? You ought to be able to cut off 25 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent." Or they quote some other theoretical percentage. But they lose sight of the fact that with this particular bill we have a very limited field in which the Committee on Appropriations can operate. In fact, I believe, of the appropriated funds carried in this bill, about 93 percent or 94 percent, or even 95 percent,

is in the category that you cannot touch unless you want to default and destroy the very programs that you have put upon the statute books, such as the railroad retirement and social-security programs.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not like to correct the gentleman, but the funds of the Railroad Retirement Board are not covered into the Treasury. They are carried in a trust fund, the gross amount of which is something in the neighborhood of \$7,000,000,000. Transfers are made from the trust fund to railroad retirement appropriations; is that not correct?

Mr. KEEFE. The chairman will be glad to answer that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is correct. We put it into the general Treasury and then we appropriate to the trust fund.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman will find there is a trust fund—

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, there is a trust fund. The appropriation we are talking about is appropriated out of the Treasury to that trust fund. The trust fund under social security represents billions of dollars. They have a trust fund under the Railroad Retirement Act, just as they have a trust fund under unemployment compensation, and just as they have a trust fund for old-age and survivors' insurance; but under the Constitution of the United States that money has to be paid first into the Treasury of the United States and we make an absolute appropriation of the total amount out of the Treasury to the trust fund for railroad retirement of the amounts that have been paid in both by the workers and the carriers. That is my understanding of the law. That goes to a trust fund, and that trust fund is managed by the Railroad Retirement Board in the payment of annuities.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reading the report on the bill, under "Grants for hospital construction," I wish the gentleman would explain how a hospital can qualify for aid under this section of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I would be glad to make an explanation on that. I think every State in the Union understands that each State may receive aid under the provision of the Hill-Burton Act; that is the Hospital Construction Act. Under that law every State has set up a hospital authority. That is a State authority, operating under the jurisdiction and direction, in most States, of the State public health service. That local State authority makes a survey of their particular State and determines the necessity for hospital beds in that State. They determine the priority, whether it shall be this type or that type of hospital, whether the hospital ought to be located here or there. That is all a matter for the determination of the local State hospital authority. A local village or city or community that is interested in build-

ing a hospital and wants to get funds under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act does not make its application to Washington. It makes its application to its own State authority, and that authority lists all of those applications and determines, as I say, the necessity and the priority under which the construction will take place. They then recommend approved projects here to Washington, and on those approved projects, for which funds are made available by the Congress each year under the Hill-Burton Act, \$75,000,000, the Washington office administering that law approves that project which has been initiated and which has been approved and presented by the State, and we furnish \$1 for each \$2 raised by the State or the local authority. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Except for this: Can a philanthropic body, not connected with a city or county or municipal government, apply for a grant?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course. Any eleemosynary institution or institution operated for nonprofit purposes is eligible to receive the benefits of the Hill-Burton Construction Act. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. McDONOUGH. It does. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to answer any questions with respect to this bill because the details are so multitudinous that you just cannot within the time limits attempt to cover all of these items. The chairman has done that very well.

Mr. FOGARTY. One thing I did not cover was that we failed to make appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board and the Conciliation and Mediation Service.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the report indicates that heretofore this bill has carried appropriation estimates for the National Labor Relations Board and the Conciliation Service. You will not find them in the bill. Action has been deferred pending action by the Eighty-first Congress, which has not yet taken place, and we do not know what that Eighty-first Congress is going to do.

That sort of leads me to rather a little bit of talk that I think we ought to discuss a little in connection with this matter. I do not want to throw any cold water on the spirit of harmony that has been manifested here, but I cannot help thinking of last year and the year before, when I was charged with the responsibility of presenting this bill to the Congress; what a belaboring I received from the Democratic side. Oh, how well I remember how we were charged with destroying the Department of Labor. Do you remember it? I have the speeches right here. I do not want to rub any salt in any old wounds, but I recall the speeches that were made, and I had to bear the brunt of that criticism. I want to tell you that I worried along with it for 2 years. I know how an assistant of the Labor Department came out into my State and charged the Eighty-first Congress, the "do nothing" Congress, with destroying the Labor Department because of cutting off its funds; and I remember how he charged that I, as the chairman of that subcommittee, was re-

sponsible for stabbing labor in the back and all that sort of tripe. I notice he has just resigned, in disgust perhaps, because he was not appointed Under Secretary of Labor; I do not know what else; but he and plenty of others reiterated that stuff to the American people, and they did it here on this floor, and they pointed out how we had cut this appropriation and cut that appropriation, and how we had destroyed labor. Do you remember that? Some of you new Members who are here for the first time, who came in on that platform perhaps, and the promise that you and the Eighty-first Congress were going to take care of it; you were going to restore the Labor Department, and you would show this miserable Eightieth Congress a thing or two; you would show them a trick with a hole in it; you would put these funds back. What have you done? Well, you have done absolutely nothing up to date, absolutely nothing; and we have been here two months and a half. You have not done anything.

I know what the temptation is to talk politics on this floor; I know what it is; I know what the temptation is to go out and talk politics to the people of the country, but are you not just a little bit ashamed now that you realize the facts and the truth? Are you not a little bit ashamed for the way you misled the people—or at least tried to mislead them—you went out and paraded this information that the Eightieth Congress had destroyed the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now, let us look at the picture. We get into a very interesting subject here now and one that I think ought to be canvassed just a little bit on this floor. I am glad to say that my friends on the majority side of this committee this year perhaps looked at the recommendations of their President and his Bureau of the Budget with very great alarm when they discovered that in actuality and in fact the Bureau of the Budget accepted almost in toto the action of the Eightieth Congress so far as appropriations for the Department of Labor were concerned. Where is all this restoration of funds? Where is all this pledge that you were going to see that the Department of Labor was built up, and that you were going to give them all the money they asked for? Is it in this bill? Go back and tell the people what you have been doing; tell them the truth. If you tell them the truth you will find that the Eightieth Congress did a pretty good job, because the President himself and his Bureau of the Budget put their seal of approval on what the Eightieth Congress did when they submitted a budget estimate this year with only an increase, a total increase as between the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress and the bill suggested here, of only \$2,176,850.

What makes that increase possible and necessary? Why, \$991,000 of it represents salary increases that the Eightieth Congress gave to employees of the Labor Department and other agencies of government which became effective last August. Do you remember that?

You are so interested in these employees and doing things for labor. But the Eightieth Congress gave these employees a pay increase last August. Of the total increase in this bill for the Labor Department for 1950, \$991,000 of it is accounted for by that pay-increase law.

That leaves \$1,185,850 and of that amount \$1,129,000 of the increase is for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Do you remember what happened on this floor last year? The committee recommended an appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that was cut down by virtue of an amendment adopted on the floor of the House. The amount of the increase that the Bureau of the Budget gives in this bill to the Bureau of Labor Statistics is practically the same amount as the committee last year gave before action was taken on the floor of the House. You are getting just about the same amount that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Eightieth Congress gave to the Labor Department in total, the total increase being \$56,850.

Now, that is the great mouse you have developed as a result of this yelling and hollering as to what the Eighty-first Congress was going to do for the Labor Department. When you are charged with the responsibility as we were last year, and you are charged with a responsibility that compels you to look facts in the face as the Bureau of the Budget did and as the President did, you will find that the Eightieth Congress did a pretty good job and you cannot improve very much on it.

That leads me to another thing.

Do you remember the editorials and the wails that went around when the subcommittee last year, and there was great force behind it, wrote a lot of legislation into the appropriation bill to streamline the Federal Security Agency? Do you remember that? Do you remember the wails that went up? I remember one article after another published in the papers of my State, vicious articles, which said that I was responsible for destroying the social-security program. Right here on this floor it was said that if the Congress accepts the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin and his subcommittee it will destroy the social-security program. Do you remember that? Oh, how I suffered under that.

Are you not a little bit ashamed of yourselves now? Are you not really ashamed of yourselves?

Now, read the record. The thing has been in operation now for a year. Do you believe Oscar Ewing, head of the Federal Security Agency? He is your boy. Do you believe Bob Goodwin, head of the Employment Service? He is your boy. Read their statements in this record. It is crystal clear that the thing is working magnificently and all this talk about what you were going to do to social security, the USES, the UC, and all that sort of thing was just a lot of boloney thrown out for pure, dirty, nasty political purposes. I want to rub your nose into it, good naturedly. I want to call to the attention of the American people how you fooled them.

Now listen, and I want you to get this. When Mr. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, was before the committee I asked him this question which you will find on page 739 of the hearings:

Mr. Ewing, first of all I want to compliment you and the agency in carrying out and accelerating, if I may use that word, the program which this committee set out for you to do with the intent of strengthening the top administration of this agency and streamlining the operations in the field. If I interpret your statement correctly, the proposal for the consolidation of the various and sundry field offices of the constituent unit agencies into the Federal Security Agency regional office set-up, with the top-flight regional director, and the people under him representing the staffing arrangement at the headquarters here, has proven to be an efficient and satisfactory step, has it not?

Mr. EWING. It has, and it is working, at the end of 7 months, very much more smoothly than we ever anticipated that it would.

Why not tell the American people the truth? We did a job in their interest and in the interest of the people of this country. And, you saved some money by doing it, too, do you know that? Yes; we closed a lot of these regional offices. You had a lot of these boys in there drawing big, fat salaries, and they squealed and they squawked, and they said, "You are going to throw us out of these fat jobs." They did not care anything about efficiency. They cared nothing about whether they were rendering service to the States or not. They were interested in their jobs as people of that kind always are. We went through it and we said, "Listen, we are setting up the Federal Security Agency on an efficient basis." I had the finest kind of help from the top-flight people in the Federal Security Agency to do that job last year. No one man could do it alone. We had wonderful help. But, the fellows on the outside, they always want to raise a political question, and the hangers-on that were getting these big, fat salaries, they did not like it.

Now, we have had it for 7 months. Mr. Ewing, Mr. Kingsley, Mr. Leo Miller, Mr. Stephens, and the people charged with the responsibility of doing that job, have done a magnificent job. And the thing is working. Has social security been destroyed? We cut a million-odd dollars off of Mr. Altmeyer's office. Did you restore it this year? You did not. You cut it even more. Why? Because we demonstrated that the job could be done without all that top-heavy overhead down there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

It seems to me that just common decency and just good neighborliness, under the good-neighbor policy, maybe, should require some of you people to go out and tell the American people the truth about the Eightieth Congress and what they did in connection with this particular program.

I wish I had time to quote all the things that are in this record. Now we are moving in that direction, and I compliment my friend from Rhode Island, who has done a pretty good job. I think he

has seen the light of this picture. Things did not work out as bad as they predicted it would last year, and we are getting some sort of management into this giant, sprawling thing we call the Federal Security Agency.

In this great field of public health that most of you know I have taken some part in for a period of years, I am proud of the work and the contribution that the Federal Government and its Public Health Service has been able to make in this great field of research and control in the matter of disease. I want you to know that the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I see eye to eye on the necessity for the continuation and the enlargement of this program. There is no politics in it. I was amazed, as he was, and no doubt you were, to read the President's budget and find where he had recommended to this Congress action which, if we allowed it to go through, would have practically destroyed these vital programs involving cancer, heart disease, and mental health.

I am glad to know, and I pay tribute to him again, that the chairman of this subcommittee has the courage, in the face of extreme pressure applied to him as the chairman of a subcommittee not to override the Presidential budget, to stand firm and say, "I am interested in the people of America and in the health and welfare of the people of America. We are not going to allow these programs to deteriorate and be cut back so that they will be destroyed."

You take your hat off to that kind of a fellow. I do. They never take their hats off to me. They throw a lot of bricks at me. But I tell you right now, I take off my hat to that kind of a fellow. I believe in tossing an orchid whenever I find that kind of behavior.

So we have this great program set up and under way. I shall not rehearse again the fine presentation that was made by the chairman of this subcommittee, but I want you to know that I have been privileged to speak over this country and in various parts of the country and to many, many audiences, and I have yet to find the first man or woman who is not willing to pay taxes to support these great programs in the interest of public health. So we are going to move forward.

This represents a compromise. There have to be compromises in all our thinking. I think the chairman and myself would have gone much further with these programs than we finally did as a result of a compromise in the subcommittee. However, as the subcommittee stands, we agreed that we would effect those compromises which are always necessary to get a job done, and we have a bill here that we all support. It is a good bill. It is one that will carry forward the program that the dirty, nasty Eightieth Congress started in many of its aspects.

Again, carrying that program forward in the interests of the welfare of the people of America, we did a thing last year that was one of the most revolutionary things in this whole program that had ever been attempted before.

The scientists of this Nation had looked forward to it for years in the field of research. That was the program of forward financing, by which we provided the funds so that one of these trainees, these young medical men who are in the field of research, could be hired in a research program and be assured that his job would not terminate at the end of any Government fiscal year.

We provided, again, for a construction program in connection with the heart and cancer programs. The President's budget cut that program out entirely, cut out practically all the forward financing. I want to ask the Budget Director or anybody else, what is the use of building all these hospitals around the country under the Hill-Burton implementation, what is the use of building this \$60,000,000 research hospital out here at Bethesda that will be the greatest research institution in the world, what is the use of doing all this research unless you are going to have the doctors and the clinicians and the people to staff these hospitals to give to the people of America the benefit of the research as it takes place?

So I am proud to have had a little part in this program, and I thank the Members of Congress who have unitedly, on both sides of the aisle, unanimously, supported this program. You have been simply wonderful. Last year when the committee came up with a brand new item to take care of public-health activities in Alaska, was there any dispute on the committee? There was not. We overwrote the budget \$1,100,000, and we are overwriting it again \$300,000 on that item, to carry forward that great work in Alaska to try to whip venereal disease and tuberculosis, to protect your son and mine who may be exposed to it as a member of our armed forces. In this field this committee and the Congress have been alert to the needs of the people of the United States. Thank God there has been no division in this field as between Republicans and Democrats. We are going to carry this program forward. We have just begun to scratch the surface. We are simply complementing and supplementing the work that is already going on in the great research centers of America, helping the magnificent men and women who are already in the field unsung and unknown, working day after day at the bench in an effort to find the causes of and a cure for cancer, for heart disease, and all these other ailments that are affecting so many people. Do you not think it is a good work? Are you not proud to be a Member of the Congress that is alert to that situation? Let me close by just saying this: We have many wonderful men and women in this country. That is what makes me believe that we can fight out our troubles and conquer almost any problem, because of the genius of the people of America. Is it not a wonderful thing that men like Maurice Goldblatt, of Chicago, a great businessman, will devote his time, effort, and money as a member of the National Advisory Heart Council trying in every way possible to find a cure for heart disease? Is it not wonderful when a man like Ernst Mahler, one of the distinguished scientists in the field of in-

dustrial chemistry, of the Kimberly-Clark Corp., will devote his time and talents and energies to help humanity serving as a member of this Advisory Council?

I could go on here for an hour and tell of the magnificent work of Dr. Wortis, of New York, in the field of psychiatry and mental health and Dr. Rhoads in the field of cancer, and Dr. White in the field of heart disease. I could tell you of these unselfish, magnificent men working here at Bethesda under the direction of one of the greatest men it has ever been my privilege to know, Dr. Dyer, head of the Institute of Health at Bethesda. I could name any number of these great men who, at great personal sacrifice, as far as money is concerned, are giving of their time, effort, and of their life in the interest of humanity. So that is why I like this bill. That is why I like the men who are on the subcommittee. This bill deals with human interest and human welfare.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a magnificent contribution to public health during the last few years, as has the committee. I, for one, am extremely grateful. My question is whether the placement service for the veterans is working out satisfactorily.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentlewoman talking about the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. There was testimony before the committee that it was. Representatives from the various veterans' organizations, appearing before the committee, said that it was. Mr. Faulkner, the Director, said that it was. Apparently the Bureau of the Budget and the President did not think so, because they cut something over a million dollars from this budget this year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I trust the Senate will put it back into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said this morning and what I had to say in my remarks a year ago, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], when he was chairman of this committee for 2 years, and myself, were in complete agreement on all items under the Public Health Service. We see eye to eye on every appropriation in the Public Health Service.

I will admit that a year ago I complained quite bitterly about the proposed changes in the Federal Security Agency. I will admit this afternoon that the changes that have been accomplished in the administration of the Federal Security Agency have been all for the good. It has all been beneficial.

I complained in the last 2 years quite bitterly about what the Eightieth Congress was doing to the Department of Labor. I do not see any reason for changing the attitude that I had 2 years ago

when I said publicly, in many speeches in the campaign last year, that the Eightieth Congress was crucifying the Department of Labor. The same type of statement I made on this floor a year ago, and 2 years ago, and I think with some justification.

I do not want to disagree too much with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], because this year above all years we have been getting along much better than we ever anticipated. But when he brings in the record of the Eightieth Congress, if I were ever a candidate as a Republican in a national election I would never want to bring up the name of the Eightieth Congress, because if there was anything that helped elect Mr. Truman as President of the United States, in my humble opinion, it was the record that was established by the Members of the Eightieth Congress.

What did they do to the Department of Labor? In the fiscal year of 1948, 2 years ago, the Eightieth Congress cut the over-all appropriations that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Labor by about 44 percent, as I recall. Let there be no mistake about that. What happened a year ago? This committee and this House cut the budget estimates of the Department of Labor by 25 percent, which was an additional 20 percent over what they cut them in 1948 fiscal year. Now, when we talked about the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they asked for, roughly, \$5,000,000 2 years ago. What did we do? We cut that Bureau by 40 percent. Our committee did it. Then when we came on the floor to present the bill, as we are today, a motion was made by a Member on the Republican side to cut the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by another million dollars. Even though we believed at that time, and said so on the floor, that it should not be cut, that is what happened.

What happened a year ago? The Bureau of Labor Statistics asked for over \$5,000,000 and we allowed them \$2,500,000 which is a little more than a 50-percent cut. And not only the cuts that were made by this committee in the last 2 years, but what I was complaining about at that time, and I believe I was right, was that we were taking these various agencies away from the Department of Labor and building up a huge administration in the Federal Security Agency. What happened years ago when we had the old Immigration Service in the Department of Labor? That was taken out. The Children's Bureau was taken out of the Department of Labor. Last year, by action of this Committee on Appropriations, we legislated the United States Employment Service out of the Department of Labor and put it into the Federal Security Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Hoover Commission has made its report, and I am now very thankful that last year when this matter was before the House we based our argu-

ment on the proposition that we should await the report of the Hoover Commission before we took any action as to whether or not the employment services should be taken out of the Department of Labor and put into the Federal Security Agency. If that had been followed we would have avoided a lot of unnecessary work, because the Hoover Commission now is recommending that the employment service be taken from the Federal Security Agency and put back into the Department of Labor where it belongs. Some of us believe that the Conciliation and Mediation Service should be put back into the Department of Labor.

I want to see the Department of Labor a real living department; I want to see it have some authority; I want to see it have some power; and this year for fiscal 1950 for the first time in years, and years, this committee has allowed the full amount that was awarded by the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Labor.

I will not admit that the figures quoted by the gentleman from Wisconsin are correct; it is not an increase; it is not something that we have made any promise on, that we are going to build this up into a great, huge, governmental agency—I do not want to see it built up unless we can justify it; but there are certain agencies like Employment Security and others that I believe belong in the Department of Labor, and I hope they will eventually be placed there.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened very carefully to what the gentleman has said. He does not challenge the figures which I submitted in my statement. I am just wondering what the gentleman's answer is? The gentleman says we have allowed the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget; as a matter of fact, the gentleman just got through saying how the first session of the Eightieth Congress cut its budget 44 percent, and the second session cut it twenty-odd percent. Has the gentleman's party restored it? Has it overriden the Bureau of the Budget to put those things back? Of course, it has not. You have accepted the figures of the Bureau of the Budget and thus accepted the action of the Eightieth Congress. That is what you have done.

Mr. FOGARTY. We like to proceed with caution in going above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget on any item for which we appropriate, and I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin agrees with me that, in general, none of us want to go above the figures that are given to us by the Bureau of the Budget, because the Bureau has an over-all budget of some forty-odd billions this year. There are a lot of items in the Department of Labor I should like to have increased, but because of the over-all limitation I felt that it was within the policy of making good government in keeping as well as we could within the figures of the Bureau of the Budget; and in only three or four outstanding instances, in public health, did we go above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget.

The fact still remains that the Eightieth Congress did more to tear down and break up the Department of Labor than any other Congress in the history of the Department, since 1913, when the Department of Labor became a Cabinet Department. I read between the lines all the way down the building up of this huge administration under Federal Security which I said a year ago if we let it go on, and on, and on, and built it up, would become such a tremendous agency that we probably could not control it in the future or control the appropriations it was demanding.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I heard the gentleman both in the full committee and in his statement here this morning, and I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he has made.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to confuse the issues here, or anything like that; but, sincerely, if I were running for reelection on the Republican ticket in the next general election, I would not bring up the matter of the Eightieth Congress. It has been so explored, and the record has been brought to every nook and corner of this country that if you want to come back do not run on the record of the Eightieth Congress. If we as Members of the Eighty-first Congress cannot do a hundredfold better job for the common, ordinary people of this country than the Eightieth Congress did in the 2 years the Republicans were in control I do not want to run for reelection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. When are you going to start?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have started. May I say to the gentleman from Maine one of the best starts of any Congress in the history of this country has been made by the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third appropriation bill that has been reported. The schedule called for now by the Committee on Appropriations is to report to the House every appropriation bill by the 1st of May. That is something which has never happened in a previous Congress. To my way of thinking, that is getting a pretty good start on what we intend to do and what we hope to accomplish in this year and the next year. We still have almost 2 years to go to make good and we are going to do our very best to make good in those 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to thank Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, for his outstanding statement made before our subcommittee and his unselfish cooperation with us in determining the needs of his departments.

I am pleased to report that the death rate from all causes in 1948 is the lowest ever recorded in the history of this country by 9.9 per 1,000 population. There is a marked decrease in the maternal and infant mortality and in such diseases as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and influenza. For example, the death rate from tuberculosis was 194 per 100,000 population in 1900, and in 1948, it was only 31 per 100,000 population.

The increase in births in 1948 was unusually great, being 3,700,000 live babies born during that year. The infant death rate also reached a new low. In 1915, we lost 100 babies out of 1,000 births, before they reached the age of 1 year. In 1948, the rate was only 32 per 1,000 births. This showing may add 17 years to the span of life. A new-born baby may now be expected to reach the age of 67, compared to 50 years in 1900. This is most encouraging, but we are now faced with the problems of the middle life, which is not as good, generally speaking. In 1948, diseases of the heart, kidney, circulatory system, and cancer accounted for 60 percent of all deaths in the United States. In 1900, the same group of diseases accounted for less than 23 percent of all deaths. Since 1900, the death rate for heart diseases and related ailments has increased from 333 per 100,000 population to 466 per 100,000 population. In the same time, cancer has increased from 64 in 1900 to 134 in 1948. This increase is likewise true in mental diseases, 600,000 mental patients now occupying beds in overcrowded hospitals in the United States.

The Public Health Service is one of the oldest Federal agencies. Last July, it celebrated its one-hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Today, it operates 25 marine hospitals and 120 out-patient clinics. It also operates hospitals for narcotic addicts and one leprosy hospital at Carville, La. The marine hospitals and clinics are the first to learn about epidemics and go into action to protect our country against spread of disease. The recent outbreak of yellow fever in Panama was soon under control by the prompt action of the United States Public Health Service. Thousands of doses of yellow-fever vaccine were flown to Panama and thousands of people were immunized against the disease. All quarantine stations and our ports were on the alert to prevent the entry of the infection into this country as well as the South American countries.

A few months ago at Donora, Pa., 20 people lost their lives due to smog. At the request of the Pennsylvania health authorities and other interested people, the Public Health Service stepped in and is making an investigation as to the causes and how to prevent similar occurrences in other communities. Numerous highly trained individuals have been experimenting for the past several

months, endeavoring to ascertain the causes of this calamity.

During the year 1948, the National Institute of Health isolated a virus of the common cold, and is now making an all-out fight against all virus diseases.

Although the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was passed, which authorizes a new laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, for extensive research in the field of water pollution, this laboratory has not yet materialized. This is badly needed, and I hope it can be made available within the near future.

While the death rate from tuberculosis, as formerly stated, has been steadily declining, we still have about 50,000 deaths yearly from this dreaded disease. The States are making more than 1,000,000 X-rays annually under the supervision of the public health, endeavoring to make an early diagnosis of the disease. It is generally known that the secret in treating tuberculosis successfully is an early recognition of the disease, and prompt and scientific treatment established at once.

In the past 10 years, the death rate from syphilis declined 45 percent. It has dropped from 21,000 in 1937 to 13,000 in 1947. There has also been a remarkable decline in congenital syphilis and central nervous system types of diseases which has been especially noticed within the past 10 years.

In the cancer field, Congress has made it possible for the Public Health Service to expand research in the National Cancer Institute and to aid non-Federal institutions in their research. While nothing striking has been brought out in the past few years as to the cause of cancer, it is felt by the authorities that the proper approach is being made and that something is bound to materialize within the near future. We must not get discouraged in this fight. We must wage war against cancer and every effort must be made to determine the causes regardless of the cost and the time it takes to accomplish this.

Concerning the problem of cardiovascular diseases, arthritis, and rheumatism, which affect the heart, we do not know the causes of many pathological conditions of the heart, but we must continue our investigations and experimentations until this problem has been solved.

The question of high blood pressure, for instance, is a question that still must be answered. Just why a young individual must have unusually high blood pressure and another individual, late in life, has a normal blood pressure or even a low type of pressure, is something that we are as yet unable to answer. However, we do know considerable about rheumatic heart disease which is commonly known in the medical profession as endocarditis. This type of heart disease, which should in reality be called infection of the heart, is most always caused by focal infection. In children, infection of the middle ear, diseased tonsils, and adenoids, and in infants pyelitis, are among the common causes of this type of heart infection. In reality, any concealed infection or pus formation within the system can readily cause endocarditis. It is vitally impor-

tant before attempting to eradicate any infection of the body, especially in children, that a few doses of penicillin be given to safeguard against heart complications. This is also true in the treatment of acute inflammatory rheumatism which so frequently causes heart complications. A few years ago, rheumatic heart disease was practically always fatal, or at least the patient was disabled for life. Today, with our modern methods of treatment, a considerable number of these cases recover.

In recent years, there has been a marked increase in diabetes. Thousands of cases have been ascertained through annual physical examinations, examinations made by insurance companies, and the armed services. A simple blood test has recently come into use to determine diabetics and potential diabetics. It is estimated that thousands upon thousands of cases of diabetes now exist that have never been diagnosed.

The dentists of this country are to be congratulated on their recent scientific studies of tooth decay and gum infection. It was only recently that sodium fluoride has become of general use in the prevention of tooth decay in children. Numerous dental treatment units are now in certain sections of the country, endeavoring to instruct teachers and parents, as well as the local dentists in the use of this unusual treatment. It is estimated that 40 percent of tooth infection and cavity formations can be lessened by the use of this remarkable drug. Many communities throughout the country are now making studies and investigations with the idea of using sodium fluoride in their drinking water. Great results may be obtained by such usage. It has also been determined in recent years that the eating of candy is a cause of a large percentage of dental cavities.

In mental diseases, our studies must continue, endeavoring to determine the causes which bring about or promote this ever increasing type of disease. We need hundreds of trained individuals in this field, as well as in the field of heart and cancer diseases to continue the scientific investigations in the effort to relieve the human race of these most dreaded afflictions.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the vast majority of the membership of the House has had numerous communications from constituents and interested parties all over the country, with regard to increasing appropriations for some of these items, especially that of mental diseases. Our committee also received hundreds of communications in this regard. We endeavored to be as liberal as possible and did increase appropriations for cancer, heart diseases, and mental disorders. However, the increase naturally had to be moderate. We will realize the importance of these subjects and millions of dollars could be spent in research which, no doubt, would be money well spent, as far as most of the taxpayers are concerned. But we felt there had to be a limit on the amount of money spent in this regard. The expense of government is terrific, and we sought to make our appropriations justifiable.

I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will realize the responsibility

that was placed on our shoulders and will collaborate with us in this respect.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, in addressing this body for the first time, one must recognize the stupendous task that falls upon every Member of the Congress of the United States. When the partisanship of the campaign is over and five men sit down as we did in this subcommittee representing different political thoughts, coming from districts having little in common—save their Americanism—one recognizes the responsibility that the public has reposed in us.

This subcommittee allowed at no time any partisanship considerations to interfere in its deliberations. We have presented to you, our colleagues, this morning a budget that is not skimpy and yet is not fattened out with unnecessary appropriations.

The Labor Department has received its just due as explained by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Public health is marching on under the guidance of the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who though not a doctor, has the heart and soul of a physician. And to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] came at all times the guidance of a successful and yet practical and humane businessman.

The Federal Security Agency appropriation consists of a direct total appropriation of one-billion-four-hundred-and-seventy-eight-million-odd dollars, an increase of \$278,000,000 above the 1949 appropriation.

In addition to this sum, there are contract authorizations of \$106,000,000.

Among the departments under the Federal Security Agency is the appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind which was set at the same amount, namely, \$115,000, as was granted last year.

The employees' compensation fund shows an increase of \$2,188,000. This is occasioned by the fact that there was an increase of approximately 15 percent in claims in 1949 over the previous year. This has been caused by the many injuries sustained during the war years when production, wages, and patriotism kept many employees on the job who thus delayed filing their claims.

The very important protection which is afforded to the food-consuming public is handled by our Food and Drug Administration. This agency is charged by law with the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the purpose of which is to protect the public from harmful, impure, or falsely labeled food and drugs. It is interesting to note that every day an average of 10 tons of rat or insect defiled foods are seized, the violators prosecuted, and the public is saved from illness and death. The committee saw fit to grant this department the sum of \$5,900,000 and for this amount the American public is certainly getting real value.

The Bureau of Vocational Education receives the exact appropriation that it

received last year, \$19,842,000, being the amount allotted by the Bureau of the Budget, plus certain allocations for Hawaii and Puerto Rico. With these allocations, the Office of Vocational Education has been allotted roughly \$24,000,000.

Vocational rehabilitation is a program that appeals to everyone, first from a humane and even from a business viewpoint. The program is jointly financed by the States and the Federal Government; the States provide the services to the individual and the States defray half the costs of medical examinations, and surgical treatments. The Federal Government pays the other half of these costs as well as the costs of administration.

We are happy to advise this body that through this agency over 65 thousand people were rehabilitated this year and approximately seventy-four thousand should be rehabilitated next year. These people now take their place in society, contribute to our tax rolls, and if there is one agency that certainly returns more than it takes, it is this vocational rehabilitation program.

The problem of grants to States for unemployment compensation presented a difficult and somewhat vexatious problem. In view of the sudden and substantial increase in work load in the various States in paying unemployment compensation during the last two or three months, your committee felt it necessary to give extended consideration to the amount of funds needed by the States next year. A deficiency of \$10,000,000 was approved by the House several days ago to give the States some additional funds to handle the recent rise in work load and with that amount, if ultimately granted, they will be able to operate during the balance of the current fiscal year to June 30, making it in all in the neighborhood of a \$150,000,000 annual operation. The committee was convinced that the budget of \$135,000,000 was insufficient for next year but it is next to impossible to forecast precisely the amount of funds needed. The record of past appropriations was that the States have had to run deficits and come in for supplemental appropriations almost every year. Some of the State costs are controllable; others are uncontrollable. In an effort to make reasonable provision for State operations, the bill provides for \$150,000,000 during the first three-fourths of the fiscal year. This should permit the States to be able to operate effectively in handling payments of unemployment compensation promptly while at the same time permitting them to maintain a vigorous and effective employment service which certainly should be maintained at a time when people are unemployed and asking for compensation payments.

The language of the bill also provides for a contingency reserve of \$7,500,000. The States and the Federal bureau have advocated some such procedure as this for several years and it is designed to provide some reasonable means for meeting emergencies when the Congress is not in session, or sudden increases in unemployment work loads which no one can foresee.

I appreciate that there are two schools of thought on the question of employment. Our committee considered all this and are united in the hope that unemployment will decrease but we are not prophets and it is our studied opinion that this appropriation will be sufficient for at least a period of 9 months and we believe for longer.

Because of the statutory obligation for public assistance which is on a State grant-matching basis, the Federal Government is obligated to appropriate \$1,058,000,000 and this amount has been included in the bill. This is an increase of \$261,000,000 over last year's budget. The Federal matching provisions were increased as of last October.

Another item that our committee has been diligent in observing is the question of administrative costs. They have been carefully pared wherever possible; for instance the Federal Security Administrator has asked for an increase of \$223,000 for additional assistants. This item has been deleted entirely from the bill.

Mindful of the statutory obligations and the forward march in the field of health and the development of our Federal security program and justice for the Labor Department, we respectfully submit this budget for the consideration of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very fine and cordial relations that this committee has enjoyed I hesitate to inject politics into the discussion. But inasmuch as the chairman of the subcommittee has seen fit to do so I say here again that I am partly in agreement and partly in disagreement with him. Rather than referring to "the record of the Eightieth Congress" I would qualify that as I have qualified some of his other statements and say, "The unknown record of the Eightieth Congress," because our greatest campaign weakness was in not making the record of the Eightieth Congress known to the American people. For had the American voters known the entire record, they would have endorsed it.

Along with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], I am serving my apprenticeship on this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. When this assignment was given me, I did not know what the future held for me in that activity. I had known the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, before having served with him on the Veterans' Legislative Committee. Judge McGRATH, a new member, I did not know. I had not had much contact with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], though I knew the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. But all of my misgivings were ill-founded and it has been a very, very pleasant relation. The hearings went forward with great dispatch. Sometimes I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], and I felt that we were taking some of these things pretty much on faith and sometimes on faith twice removed, because the gentle-

man from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] had gone into many of these matters with the various witnesses in very great detail over the past 2 years. We did not know them so well, but having faith in the chairman and the former chairman, and having faith in their faith in some of these witnesses, we took some of their statements just that way.

There was not complete unanimity. I thought some of the items could have been scaled down some more. I thought very few of them needed more than the budget allowed. We heard the presentations. All of our differences were in the committee room. There they were settled and we are unanimous in our position on this bill today.

The chairman remarked that we were called upon to consider some ILO funds. Our discussion of that and the hearings disclosed that as far as we saw the legislative authority which was cited to us did not relate to appropriations to this particular phase of the matter at all but rather to the Department of State. While we are mentioning ILO, I think some of you gentlemen may find some very interesting reading if you get the reports of the International Labor Organization, particularly the convention adopted by that organization in Philadelphia in 1945. You may find there some of the roots or some of the ideas for some of the far-reaching programs that have been suggested to the Eighty-first Congress in the last few weeks.

On the matter of railroad retirement, as has been suggested, Congress is dealing with trust funds. This appropriation does not come out of the general treasury as we think of appropriations, but nevertheless this committee has a duty to perform. We are obliged to see that these trust funds are properly handled and that they are handled with as great economy and efficiency as is humanly possible to conserve all of the funds available in that trust, so that the employees of the railroads may have full benefit thereof.

Mention has been made of the appropriation this year for old age assistance, and dependent and crippled children. That is a thousand and fifty-eight million dollars. Yes, \$1,058,000,000. That is a great sum. To show you how these programs grow—well, it sounds like the Old Gold program that we hear on Sunday night—they grow and grow and grow. The first appropriation for old age assistance in 1938 was \$214,000,000. Today it is \$1,058,000,000; it tripled in the last few years, so they tell us. It makes us wonder where it is going in the next few years. We should see in our minds, as we think of these things, the sign on the railroad crossing, "Stop, look and listen." Where are all of these funds coming from? Where are they going? If you read some of the tables that were placed in these hearings at my request you will see that some of these programs look like the old game of put and take. Some States put in millions and millions of dollars and take little out; other States put in very little and take out enormous sums. It may be interesting if the Members study this juggling of funds and see how

the redistribution of wealth has taken place in the activities of this Government.

In the unemployment program we found some interesting information. The Congress and the public should be informed as to the charges made by some of the inadequate way in which it is claimed that the States have been carrying on their unemployment service; that they are not doing a proper job of scanning all these applications for unemployment payments. Well, there is not much mystery about it. The States can only do so much with the money that is recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and allotted to them by appropriations. We find that from these taxes on employers, the Federal Treasury has received \$1,313,580,000. That money has gone into the Federal Treasury. How much has gone out to the States for administration and in payment of benefits to employees, in these various State offices in that period of time? Five hundred and forty-eight million dollars, which means that there has been a net profit to the Treasury of the United States of \$800,000,000. If that \$800,000,000 paid in as a special fund by the employers of this Nation had been distributed to the States of this Nation, I dare say there would have been a much better job done, especially in the screening of many of these claims, and many, many millions of dollars might well have been saved.

According to the chairman [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] there has been a great deal of improvement in efficiency in the Federal Security Agency in its application of the programs. From the admissions made to us, there can be still greater improvement. Mr. Ewing and Mr. Kingsley both admitted that there was a great deal of overlapping of programs. When we tried to find out where the overlapping is, they said, "Well we do not know where it is, but we know it is there." The heads of these various offices, along with the various employees who handle the financial activities and the budget matters, might very well look into some of these overlapping programs and eliminate those that now overlap. We will then have a still more efficient department there than we now have.

Two things have not been mentioned, but I think this House should give some detailed thought to them. One is Howard University. Starting on page 688 of the hearings, you will find the full and complete hearings on this great school. Starting on that page, you will find where Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, the president of this university, told the entire story of the fine work they are doing, of the type of graduate they are turning out, the faculty they have, the difficulties they have encountered. But they are doing a marvelous job, and they are working on a great asset of this country, namely, young people of America. To carry on this program, constantly increasing appropriations have been made. The young colored people going out of there as graduates are doing a marvelous job not only in teaching but in medicine, dentistry, engineering, and all the other courses that are made available. Dr. Johnson is

to be commended on the fine leadership he has given to the school and its pupils over a period of years, and the fine example he makes for them. He told us that he had come there to take a temporary job when he took that assignment, but that temporary job now has lasted over 20 years, according to my recollection. He can well be proud of the work he has done.

Many people seem to have the idea that Howard University is completely financed by the Federal Government. That is not true. The school is not financed completely by Federal funds at all. You will find that the students attending that school pay over \$1,000,000 for their tuition just as in other schools. It is true there is a very considerable amount appropriated to finance the school, and properly so, I think, in view of all the circumstances, the past history and the very fine work they are doing. The money spent there will eventually repay this Nation not only in the services of those graduates but in the fine caliber of citizenship that will be there developed.

The other item that should be mentioned here, is Freedmen's Hospital, the cost of which runs more than the cost of a normal hospital because it is an adjunct of Howard University. The young colored students of medicine are taking much of their training and some of their internship there. With the added use of this hospital for education there is, of course, a greater cost of operation than there might be in some other hospital.

Before my time expires there is one question that I feel should be answered. That is one about the reduction of \$11,000,000 in the appropriations for general health. This program is in addition to the special ones relating to cancer, heart, tuberculosis, venereal disease, and all that. We looked over that program, which called for an increase of more than 100 percent over last year's budget. They told us that the \$11,000,000 they had last year took this general health service to communities with a total population of 90,000,000 people. They wanted to more than double it, and thus increase the scope of activity to only another 10,000,000 people. We thought that they just were not making a showing of sufficient utility of the dollars to justify this increase in appropriation; therefore, it was denied. Even though the increase was denied, their present activities will not be curtailed.

In closing, I, too, want to commend the chairman and other members of the committee on the very fine way in which this bill has been handled. Although nearly all of my suggestions for decreases were overruled, it was done with such a charming smile and courtesy that even though I did not get the proposals over, the wound was not deep.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

IS IT A FAIR DEAL TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST INDEPENDENT UNIONS IN WRITING OUR LABOR LAWS?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, it has always been my contention that whenever Congress considers labor legislation care must be taken to see that all work-

ing men and women are treated fairly and squarely, not just the few millions who happen to be members of the CIO or the AFL.

It is commonly overlooked in Congress and in public discussions and in the newspapers that there are hundreds of independent unions with millions of members in these United States. They have a perfect right to be considered in all our discussions and considerations. It also frequently is overlooked that there are millions of laboring men and women who do not belong to any union. They, too, of course, should have a place in our minds when we think of legislation for all the people of our Nation.

Personally, my study of independent unions has proved to me that these can be the most effective for the individual worker and yet not be subjected to all the ills and weaknesses and abuses to which the big unions sometimes have been subjected. The members of the independent unions are more aware of their role in union affairs; they are more anxious to preserve their unions and to increase production. They have better leaders, all things considered, than do the members of the huge, mass unions which could prove so dangerous if infiltrated by the Communists and misled by men who want to make over America.

Mr. Chairman, I am referring to these independent unions at this time because of a recent visit with Floyd Huber and Maurice Porter, representatives of the independent union of the Sutherland Paper Co., at Kalamazoo, Mich. They are constituents of mine and I know them to be patriotic, sincere, honest, hard-working Americans. This also is true of most of their members, and of the vast majority of the workmen in my district, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Mr. Huber and Mr. Porter understand that there is to be a repeal of the labor law we passed 2 years ago and that another labor law is to be enacted. I do not know whether this is to be the case or not, as yet, but I hear it myself. Personally, I am strongly in favor of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill. I voted for it before and I will vote for it again, although it, like all legislation, has some points in it that could be revised without too great difficulty.

The two independent union representatives brought me a resolution which their union had passed at a recent meeting. With the permission of my colleagues, I should like to read this resolution:

Whereas there have been instances of discrimination against segments of American labor; and

Whereas new legislation is presently being formulated: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Confederated Unions of America at this time present to the Congressmen of each individual State, these four points to be made a part of the new labor law:

1. In deciding all cases under the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with the labor organizations national or international in scope.

2. Equal representation in the Department of Labor.

3. Upon request of the parties in dispute, the Secretary of Labor shall furnish arbitrators—all cost of which is to be borne by the National Government;

4. In the appointment of Labor-Management Advisory Committees for respective industries, equal representation must be granted all unions whether or not the union is national or international in scope.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there are many men in the Congress who are opposed to discrimination. At this time, a great deal of talk for and against discrimination is being heard on every side.

I am personally opposed to discrimination. Let me urge my colleagues to stand beside me. The particular discrimination to which I object—although there are many others, of course—concerns these independent unions. Of all the minorities in America, I sometimes think they are more discriminated against than any other.

For years, the present political administration has ignored the leaders of these independent unions. No independent union representative ever has been chosen to become an Assistant Secretary of Labor. There is a vacancy now in the Department of Labor for a union man of high caliber. But is any consideration being given to the idea of putting an independent union leader in that post? Not that I have heard of. I urge the President and his coworkers to consider this idea. While the suggestion comes from a Republican, it is still a good suggestion and I hope that some one among "the powers that be" will act upon it.

Likewise, for many years, under the old Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Board as constituted in the hey-day of the New Deal, independent unions could expect no mercy if they happened to run afoul either the AFL or the CIO. The NLRB in those days invariably discriminated against the independents and in favor of the major unions. Only during the past 2 years has the NLRB made any attempt to deal fairly and squarely with the independent unions.

Yet, even under the Taft-Hartley law, there have been some discriminations against the independent unions, although not purposely so, of course. A provision in the law makes it mandatory for any union in a dispute to pay a part of the cost of the mediation. The costs in such cases, to the big unions, were inconsequential. But to the small, independent unions, these costs are exorbitant. It is manifestly unfair to ask the small, independent unions to bear the same share of this cost that the large, well-financed unions, with millions of members, are asked to pay.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am against discrimination, and I know that you and other Congressmen join with me in the determination to do everything possible to stop the discrimination against small, independent unions. They are composed of the hard-working, thoughtful, patriotic, law-abiding citizens America needs in this crucial period. We should encourage them, not discourage them.

The Government, in all its resources and majesty, could afford to pay the relatively small sums for conciliation and

arbitration needed in various union disputes. The members of small, independent unions should not be penalized by having to pay these costs.

Mr. Chairman, President Truman has told the people of the country that his administration is to be the Fair Deal administration. If this is true, the discrimination against independent unions must cease. Members of these independent unions should be given equal consideration under our labor laws with members of the AFL and CIO.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and retired personnel service law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, approved June 24, 1948), and under the act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the merchant marine, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$270,000.

Mr. FOGARTY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be subject to points of order and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any amendments to be offered?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE: Page 32, line 18, after the word "year", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That any State receiving a grant for such assistance or aid shall not require as a condition precedent from any recipient of such assistance or aid a promise, bond, or lien whereby such recipient or his or her estate shall be held to make repayment or restitution in the amount or part of any assistance or aid received by such recipient."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I add that it also imposes additional duties on the Department in question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is definitely in order. I merely wish to call to the attention of the Chair the decision by the House not many days ago when the deficiency appropriation bill was before us, when an amendment similar to this was

offered to that bill and the ruling of the Chair was that the amendment was proper and in order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would entail additional duties upon the agency involved. Therefore, it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 29, lines 8 to 17, strike out the first proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That, to the extent that the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Budget, finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from change in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the original State's grant was based, this appropriation may be apportioned and obligated at an annual rate not in excess of \$150,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include an address and in the other to include a letter written to the President of the United States.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include a magazine article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a certain article.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. BIEMILLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement he made before the Rules Committee.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an open letter by Generoso Pope.

Mr. FORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution from the city of Grand Rapids.

## RADAR AIR WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 129 and asked for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] 30 minutes; and pending that, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill (H. R. 2546) a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

This is a highly technical matter. It is not such a matter that one who has had as little opportunity as I have had to study it, could intelligently discuss or explain. The learned gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who

is a member of the Armed Services Committee, is fully familiar with the purposes and necessity for this legislation. I shall, therefore, defer to him and not take the time of the House myself. I am sure that when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole that he will give the House the necessary information to justify this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since I have no request for time on this side, I shall move the previous question on the resolution unless the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] desires to speak or has request for time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the Republican side.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2546, with Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan for 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the Committee for consideration, H. R. 2546, is of the most urgent character; it is necessary for the maintenance of our national security. The bill provides for the erection of public works, including buildings, facilities, utilities, and roads in both the continental United States and in Alaska, which may be necessary to provide for the establishment of an adequate air warning and control system. Let me make doubly clear what I just said by emphasizing again that the authorization in this legislation is merely a public-works authorization. At the same time, however, the bill has much broader and more far-reaching implications. The construction of the public works which it will authorize is a necessary prerequisite to the setting up of an aircraft warning and control system which will alert our people and our defensive forces in sufficient time to permit the employment of all effective means of defense available to us against attacking enemy aircraft seeking to destroy our vital centers of production and population. The public works themselves will not provide us with an operational system; in addition

there must be radar equipment, communications equipment, and an organization, in being, manned by highly trained technical personnel. But all of these essential elements must await the construction of the necessary public works.

An aircraft warning and control system is vitally needed for the protection of the United States. But let me make clear at the outset that such a system in and of itself alone by no means guarantees us security against injury from enemy air attack. To understand why this is so we must first know exactly what an aircraft warning and control system is and, secondly, what it is capable of doing and what it cannot do.

The primary purpose of such a system is to detect approaching enemy aircraft in sufficient time before they arrive at vital targets to permit friendly interceptor fighters to be directed against the enemy planes so that they may destroy them before they have accomplished their mission.

That is not the only purpose of such a system but it is by far its most important function. Other purposes are to alert other active defensive forces such as antiaircraft batteries and, also, to give air-raid warnings in order that every available means of passive defense as well may be employed.

But turning back again to what I said was the most important function, namely, the direction of interceptor fighters, let me explain why this is true.

As we all know, it is an axiom of military operations that the best defense is a good offense. This principle applies with full force in the case of air defense against attacking enemy aircraft. If we merely sound our air-raid warnings when enemy planes approach, it will be possible indeed for our population to seek cover in air-raid shelters and to take other measures of a passive category. But none of these passive defensive measures will stop the enemy bombers from coming over the targets and dropping their bomb loads. Much more can be accomplished if we mount an actual offensive against the enemy planes. That is, if we attack them with every means at our disposal. To a limited extent we can do this with antiaircraft, but this means again that we are seriously restricted because the enemy planes cannot be attacked until they actually fly within range of the antiaircraft batteries. We could, of course, deploy antiaircraft guns in such a way that no possible area of the sky was not covered, but the cost of any such fantastic proposal would be out of this world.

It is easy to see, therefore, why fighter aircraft afford the best available means of defense over large areas such as that of the United States. Because of their tactical mobility fighters can move around over large areas to any point where attacking hostile aircraft may appear. We can thus obtain a far greater degree of protection and can intercept a good many of the attacking aircraft long before they reach their targets, and can do so far more economically than if we made the entire countryside bristle with antiaircraft guns.

Now there are several technical points about an aircraft warning and control system which ought to be made very clear. When I say that they are technical, I do not mean that they are beyond the comprehension of a layman; on the contrary, an understanding of these features is essential to an understanding of the purposes of and the need for this legislation.

First of all, an aircraft warning and control system performs considerably more than the mere function of detection and early warning of approaching aircraft as they cross our borders. A flight of enemy planes entering the United States at a given point might be destined for any one of a great number and variety of vital strategic targets located one, two, or three or more hours of flight time away from the point of entry. If we knew that the planes had entered the United States, we could, of course, alert the entire country with consequent stoppage of production while the whole population scurried for air raid shelters. The absurdity of such a procedure is obvious. It is also clear that if we knew merely that at a given moment the planes had crossed our border and thereafter had no knowledge of their subsequent path, we would have no way of telling our fighters where to intercept them. It would do no good to send our interceptor planes to the point where the enemy had crossed the border because by the time they arrived there the enemy will have long since passed on.

Faced with these problems, therefore, it is plain that we must provide some method of continually tracking enemy aircraft once they have been detected so that we will know at any moment thereafter exactly where they are and what changes of direction they may take. Only by continually tracking the enemy position can we lead our friendly fighters to the kill.

It is this element of fighter direction which is the most important single function of an aircraft warning and control system. It is this which gives the system the name "control." What the system accomplishes is first, to detect and constantly track approaching enemy aircraft and, secondly, to issue orders to friendly interceptors to take off and attack the enemy. While they are doing so they are guided by control centers on the ground to the point of interception. Should the enemy change his course radically between the time the friendly fighters take off and the time they catch him, the control centers on the ground will be able to detect this change of course by means of the continual tracking process, and will be able to alter the course of our fighters accordingly.

Now I am sure that most of you gentlemen are familiar with the method in which radar is employed as the means for detecting and tracking the enemy planes and for directing our own planes against them. At the cost of repeating some information with which I am sure many of you are thoroughly familiar, it might be advisable nevertheless to go over some of the characteristics of radar rather briefly.

As you know, radar was developed shortly before World War II and was

shrouded in secrecy during that conflict, so much so that for a long time even the name "radar" itself was taboo. We all know today, however, that it was one of the most important developments contributing to our successful operations in World War II, and it is very important that we should also fully realize in considering the pending legislation that it was radar which won the Battle of Britain. Radar, employed in much the same manner that we propose to employ it under this bill, was the key to the aircraft warning and control system established by the British. It was by means of radar that the approach of Hitler's planes was detected and by means of radar that the RAF defenders were guided to an interception.

Radar functions on a very simple principle despite the fact that complicated electronic equipment is required to make use of this principle. An ultra high-frequency transmitter sends out a radio wave of very high frequency. This wave travels through space until it strikes a target such as an approaching enemy plane, an enemy surface ship, or a distant mountain and a portion of the wave is then reflected back to the transmitting station where it is picked up by a receiver. Both the transmitter and the receiver, of course, are all part of the radar set. In addition, the set contains an electronic device capable of measuring the lapse of time between the instant when the radar impulse or wave was sent out and the instant when it returned. Since the speed at which the wave travels through space is known, the radar set computes the distance at which the target which reflected back a part of the wave is located. Also, because it is possible to control the direction in which the wave is beamed in the first instance, the radar set can tell us not only how far the target is but in what direction it lies. These two elements, direction and distance, enable us to locate the target's exact position on the map with reference to the known position of the radar set.

Now you will remember that I said a moment ago that a portion of the wave would be reflected back. Other portions of the same wave will travel out farther to other targets and the radar set will then show these to lie at a greater distance and in perhaps a slightly different direction. The point I want to bring out is one with which most of us are thoroughly familiar, namely, that our present-day radars as developed during World War II permit us to see a picture of the entire area within a distance of many miles in all directions from the radar set. The radar actually gives us a picture very much like a map on which we can see mountains, airplanes, high buildings and chimneys and, if at sea, ships, aircraft, land, and so forth. In other words, when used in an aircraft warning and control system, it will give us a continual picture of the enemy planes moving across the screen and it will also show us our own fighter planes and permit us to see at any instant whether they are headed on the proper course for an interception.

I said a few moments ago that radar was responsible for winning the Battle of Britain. This brings me to one of the

most important points which we must constantly bear in mind in our consideration of the present legislation. An aircraft warning and control system will not under any circumstances guarantee us absolute security. There is no means known to science or the military today whereby we can throw an impenetrable ring or barrier around the United States which will protect us against all injury from enemy air attack. We cannot hope to keep out completely all enemy bombers who may seek to destroy vital centers. The best we can do is to destroy some of them and to attempt insofar as we can to disorganize their mission so completely that those we cannot shoot down will unload their bombs over some mountain-side perhaps, instead of over a railroad yard. But even then many of the enemy's planes may still get through to points where vital damage can be done.

Radar and the aircraft warning and control system in which it was employed in the Battle of Britain did not win World War II, nor did it prevent tremendous destruction and loss of life in London, Coventry, and other cities. Neither did it destroy the German Luftwaffe. But granting all this to be true, let us make no mistake about its effectiveness. Had it not been for radar and for the British aircraft control and interception system by which Spitfires were unleashed against the oncoming Luftwaffe, it is virtually certain that the Battle of Britain would have been lost. And there can be no doubt that the ensuing destruction of cities and loss of life would have been of untold proportions so grave that the actual damage done in World War II would look negligible by comparison. Had Britain not possessed this system, she could have offered no effective defense against the German attacks.

It is because no other means exist for effectively utilizing our defensive capabilities that we so urgently need an aircraft warning and control system in this country. We must have the means by which we too can detect, track, and effectively intercept enemy aircraft threatening our homeland. Such a system is indispensable to the economical and effective use of our defensive weapons such as fighter aircraft and antiaircraft artillery. Without such a system it would be theoretically possible to deploy fighters so thickly in the air space over the United States that they could not fail to intercept any attack, but it is equally clear that the economy of this country would collapse before we were able to build the number of planes which would then be required. An aircraft warning and control system permits us to make the most effective and economical use of the planes and the guns which we have. It tells us that the enemy planes are here—and not over there somewhere; it thus enables us to direct our fighters here—instead of having them patrol aimlessly somewhere else. It also tells us that we must take passive defense measures and seek security in air-raid shelters here—and that it will not be necessary to do so in other places. Thus production may continue uninterrupted everywhere else although it may be necessary to suspend it temporarily here while the attack is in progress.

As the aircraft warning system used in the Battle of Britain did not suffice to destroy the Luftwaffe, nor to prevent many of its planes from bombing London, neither can we reasonably expect complete security from the system which will be provided under this bill. But what the Battle of Britain did accomplish, and what we can reasonably expect from our own aircraft warning and control system under comparable circumstances, was to provide the means whereby the interceptor fighters of the RAF were able to exact such a high toll of German bombers that Hitler was suddenly brought to the realization that the attacks were unprofitable in terms of the balance between the damage inflicted on Britain and the losses which he was suffering. This consideration alone forced Hitler to the conclusion that the German economy could not much longer stand the drain resulting from the high attrition rate imposed upon his bombers.

In like manner we hope to establish in the United States a warning and control system which will permit us to use our own interceptor planes so effectively that we can impose a prohibitive attrition rate upon enemy bombers seeking to destroy our vital centers. We cannot escape unscathed without a scratch, nor can we hope to avoid being hurt—perhaps badly in some places. But if we can provide the means whereby our fighters can hurt the hostile bombers badly enough to make the enemy call the whole thing off, the aircraft warning system will have fully justified the expenditure of every penny invested in it.

When we consider how much more effectively we will be able to use our defensive fighter aircraft with an aircraft warning and control system, it becomes very clear that we may actually be able to reduce the over-all cost of air defense because of the simple fact that a lesser number of fighters can be used more effectively. I do not mean to imply by this that we can afford any reduction in the number of fighters presently planned, even with such a system in being. The point is that we would need a great many more to adequately protect the United States if we do not provide an aircraft warning and control system.

An aircraft warning and control system consists essentially of radar stations, control centers, and communications facilities. An individual radar station will pick up enemy planes on its radar screen, and after identifying them as hostile aircraft, will communicate information as to their location to a control center. The control center will have operational control over defensive fighter aircraft and antiaircraft weapons and will immediately alert all defensive forces under its command which can be brought to bear upon the enemy. It will issue orders to fighters to take off and will guide them to a point of interception.

From what I have said to you so far, I believe it will be quite obvious that an aircraft warning and control system must be set up in such a manner as to provide a sufficient interval of time between initial detection and interception to permit all the necessary steps in the process to be taken before the enemy planes reach vital targets. In other

words, the radar stations which detect the planes must be so located geographically in relation to vital strategic targets that the process of identification as enemy aircraft, transmission of information to a control center, orders to fighters, take-off of fighters, climb to enemy altitude and actual interception—so that all of these steps in the process can be accomplished before the enemy bombers arrive at their assigned targets.

Radar unfortunately has certain technical limitations. The radio waves or beams which it utilizes cannot be directed below the horizon. In other words, radar cannot "see" around the horizon and hence can detect only those targets which are above the line of sight to the horizon. It is this feature which made it possible for low-flying planes during World War II to escape detection by radar as they approached their targets. Just as a high mountain can be seen over the horizon, so also can a plane flying at higher altitudes. For all practical purposes, therefore, the range of radar is limited to about 150 miles, assuming that the attacking planes fly at altitudes which are tactically feasible. However, we can obtain greater range by deploying an additional radar station beyond the first. This would give us what was recently referred to in the newspapers as a two-notch program, whereas one station would represent what we might call a one-notch program. You may ask why, if we use two notches, we could not dispense with the original notch on the inside. We would still require that in order to enable us to continually track the enemy after he had passed inside the range of the outer radar station. Otherwise, without the inner station we would merely obtain early warning from the outer screen, but we would not know what the enemy's position was subsequently and hence we would be unable to continually track him until our fighters were able to complete the interception.

Because the basic active defense weapon for any large area is the fighter airplane, the first and most important consideration in organizing an aircraft warning and control system is to meet the requirements for fighter defense.

Fighters may be moved quickly to meet changing situations, but an aircraft-warning system is relatively fixed and immobile. We must, therefore, provide an aircraft-warning service in those areas in which it appears likely that we may be required to deploy fighters. The establishment of an aircraft-warning system is, in effect, an organization of the ground to provide a capability for utilizing fighters effectively. Actual fighter deployment will depend upon the force available and the tactical situation.

Aircraft warning requirements for fighter defense are based largely on the time and space relationship between friendly fighter performance, enemy aircraft performance, radar performance, geographic deployment of fighter airfields, geographic deployment of radar stations, and geographic location of the boundary of the area being defended.

Defensive fighter aircraft on ground-alert status at an airfield will be ready to take off on orders from a control center. However, because of the time ele-

ment involved in the performance of all the necessary steps which must take place between the time of initial detection of enemy aircraft and the time of completion of interception, the enemy aircraft will have advanced a considerable distance during this interval. Hence an area lying between the point where they were originally detected and the point of interception by friendly fighters cannot be defended by the fighters; an area lying behind the point of interception by the fighters may, on the other hand, be considered to be defended.

From this it is very clear that if we can extend our early warning frontiers farther out, so to speak, we should be able to discover the enemy earlier, thus permitting fighters to intercept him earlier, and thereby extending the cover of fighter protection over a larger territory.

Where it is necessary to protect a vital target lying out in an area which is not defended, that is exactly what we will do. We will deploy an additional radar station farther out, thereby extending the cover of fighter protection to the target in question. In this manner, simply by deploying a radar station outward, we can obtain the same additional degree of protection which could otherwise be achieved only by the construction of an additional fighter airfield at a considerably greater expense.

The deployment of radar stations and control centers under the proposed program is designed to achieve full utilization of available fighter airfields.

The control centers, which will exercise tactical control over defensive fighter aircraft, will be provided, of course, with their incoming lines of communication from outlying radar stations which will furnish information of approaching hostile aircraft. But, in addition, they will also have lines of communication to civil and military airfields, both Air Force and Navy, for the operational control of fighters; to local antiaircraft artillery defenses; and to CAA traffic centers for movement liaison and control. Finally, there will be lines to local military commands for air-raid warnings and, also, off-shore radio liaison for coordination with naval ships and forces at sea. The control center will be the point from which all air-defense operations are controlled and directed for a given area. It is to be the command post of the air-defense area in which it is located. I will now proceed to a description of these areas.

The entire United States must be organized into air-defense areas to enable us to conduct an effective air defense. As I said a few moments ago, the system which it is proposed to establish is essentially an organization of the ground to provide a capability for utilizing our defensive fighter aircraft effectively. Accordingly, the entire United States will be divided into eight air-defense areas for peacetime and initial operations in war.

Upon mobilization of the Air National Guard, the eight original areas will be subdivided to make a total of 20 air-defense areas, covering the entire United States. Each of these areas will be under the command of an area air-defense

commander whose command post will be a control center. Of the 12 control centers to be brought into operation and manned by the Air National Guard a few days after mobilization, 10 are to be used as peacetime training stations at the home of the unit. The other two centers will have to be manned by National Guard units from other areas. These two must be constructed in advance and ready to receive the National Guard units. These two, plus the eight initial centers, make up the total of 10 centers in our current construction program.

The closest possible coordination exists between the Air Force and the Army and Navy in connection with this program, and I might say that the committee has been impressed by the cooperation evidenced by the three services and by the complete absence of the slightest indication of the existence of any inter-service problems or controversies in this field. The only difficulties which exist today are those which stem from purely technical problems rather than from questions of responsibility.

Under the program planned, the commander of the eastern and western air defenses, respectively, will be charged with coordination with eastern and western sea frontiers and with the appropriate United States Army commanders in matters of mutual defense.

This program will provide the United States with the minimum acceptable degree of protection from a military point of view, but, at the same time, it is one which is economically feasible. It will furnish us with a modest degree of protection at a very reasonable cost; without this system we would have no protection whatsoever against attack by enemy aircraft.

It will require a considerable length of time to install and perfect this system and to make it operational. This element of lead time is of vital importance in our consideration of the present legislation. If the protection sought by this bill is to become a reality within a reasonable time in the future, we must act at once to get this program under way. Prompt and early action is essential if the United States is to have an adequate system of air defense within a reasonable time in the future. In this connection, let me point out that the achievement of an operational system in being will be necessary before we can expect protection from an aircraft warning and control system. The mere construction of buildings and installation of equipment is not sufficient. The system must be a going concern—an organization of large numbers of technical and operating personnel who have had extensive training and experience over a long period of time. I can think of no more appropriate illustration of the importance of this factor than the recent press reports regarding the failure of Navy radar operators to detect the approaching aircraft which recently dropped a simulated A bomb over a task force in the current fleet maneuvers. It is inconceivable that such penetration could have been accomplished without detection in actual operations during World War II when all

personnel and units were in a high state of training and readiness.

The proposed program is of high priority, particularly in view of the time factor mentioned which will be required not only to accomplish the prompt installation of radar equipment, but also to achieve the required level of training and operational experience necessary to make the system fully operational. Until the system is in being and operationally effective, the Air Force cannot hope to discharge its primary responsibility for the air defense of the United States. Neither can the forces of the Army and the Navy, which those Departments will be required to furnish in defense of the United States against air attack, be utilized with maximum effectiveness unless employed in conjunction with a land-based air-defense system. The establishment of the system, however, will facilitate the development of tactics and techniques for joint employment of all available forces for air defense.

Because of the vital importance of this program as a defensive measure, the Air Force deemed it appropriate to request specific authority for the construction herein authorized, apart from the usual public-works program.

A construction program amounting to \$85,500,000 will be authorized pursuant to the authority contained in this bill. This sum includes only the cost of construction of buildings, facilities, utilities, and other public works. It does not include the acquisition cost of real estate nor the cost of radar and communications equipment.

The total over-all cost of the air-warning and control system, including those costs which are not covered by the present legislation, will amount to approximately \$161,000,000, exclusive of personnel costs. This sum includes an item of \$42,250,000, representing the value of radar and communications equipment now on hand, which has already been bought and paid for. It also includes \$7,000,000 for the cost of conversion and equipment of four radar picket vessels to be provided by the Navy under the program. These four vessels will be used to provide radar coverage over sea approaches in localities where the proximity of vital targets to the coast line precludes the deployment of land-based radar installations sufficiently far out to permit early warning and interception of enemy planes. Funds for these vessels were requested by the Navy but were deleted from current budget estimates prior to submission to the Congress. It is understood that the Navy already has a number of vessels of this character; hence these vessels can be provided by the Navy, even though funds are not included in the budget. In furnishing them, however, the Navy will be compelled to reduce correspondingly the amount of radar protection furnished by vessels of this character to the operating forces at sea.

After deducting the value of existing equipment and the cost of the picket vessels, there remains a total estimated cost of about \$112,000,000, for which the Air Force will have to obtain new funds. This sum consists of the \$85,500,000 for which authorization for construction is

sought in the present bill, and also of an item of about \$26,000,000 representing the cost of new radar and communications equipment, authority for the procurement of which exists independently of this bill.

This program has been considered by intelligence agencies looking at our strategic make-up from the point of view of a possible enemy. It will not furnish absolute protection, but it will give us a reasonable degree of protection where protection is needed at a cost which the economy of this country can sustain. Moreover, it represents a balanced program in which this particular project is in balance with other armed services' projects. It takes account also of the great strategic importance of Alaska where existing radar facilities are totally and wholly inadequate. In this connection, I might say also that testimony was received during the hearings from responsible officers of the Air Force to the effect that words would be impossible to describe how poor our radar defenses in the continental United States are today. This program has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget.

In view of the fact that this particular legislation is designed merely to authorize the construction of the necessary public works, the Committee on Armed Services believes it appropriate to limit the authorization contained in this bill to \$85,500,000. The bill has been amended accordingly, but with the clear understanding and intent that this limitation shall apply only to construction costs and will in no way limit the cost of procurement or installation of radar and communications equipment or other technical equipment required to establish an operational system in being. It is intended that this limitation shall apply expressly and exclusively to construction costs alone. The Committee on Armed Services and its staff has made a very careful and thoroughgoing study and analysis of the pending legislation. Prior to the hearings, a comprehensive list of written questions pertaining to almost every conceivable question which might arise in connection with this bill was submitted to each of the three armed services, and written replies were requested. Much of the information furnished in response to these queries was classified and hence cannot be made available. However, those replies which did not require classification for reasons of military security have been printed in the hearings and may be found at pages 352 to 359.

Complete and exhaustive hearings were held before the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and by the full committee, and in both instances a motion to report the bill favorably was carried unanimously.

Despite the fact that a great deal of the information pertaining to this bill and obtained both during the hearings and in answer to the written questions is of a highly classified nature, I believe the Members of the House will find ample justification for this legislation in the open hearings and the committee report.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

At the outset I wish to compliment the able and distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] for his concise and clear presentation of this legislation. Any further remarks as to the purposes of this bill are unnecessary.

I would state, however, that this legislation comes to the floor by a unanimous vote of the committee. There is no opposition on the part of the minority members. All agree that it is essential that land-based air warning and control installations should be installed as soon as possible for our national security. It is recommended by the Department of the Air Force and all other defense-minded agencies, including the Aviation Policy Committee of the Eightieth Congress.

I urge the unanimous adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress in its report dated March 1, 1948, entitled "Senate Report No. 949" had the following to say, as a fifth recommendation:

There should be established a joint task group designed to withstand an initial attack directed at the United States and to form the basic organization for a strong territorial defense. Defense plans must contemplate an aggressive attack designed to cripple our centers of war potential. In the current atomic age it may be expected that such attacks on the United States will be delivered by air with little or no warning. Now is the time to organize the internal defenses in order to localize and repel such an attack. It is imperative that an air-warning network be extended in all directions from which an attack may be expected. Economy may be achieved by employing elements of the civil-airways system wherever practicable.

Then, with reference to recommendation No. 6:

A competent aircraft-warning network should be established under the direction and control of the proposed territorial command. An aircraft-warning network is composed essentially of long-range surveillance radar and a system of rapid communication. As much of this system as can be employed feasibly and integrated into the civil-airways traffic-control system should be so employed. This will provide economy by avoiding duplication as well as providing a reservoir of highly skilled operators and technicians in an emergency.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the floor of the House to authorize the construction of those works necessary for the Military Establishment in connection with the early-warning network intended to cover the United States. There is also being set up in the Civil Aeronautics Administration a system which will employ radar in civil-airways traffic control. As much of that system and its communication system as are possible to be employed jointly and in conjunction with the Military Establishment in the event of war is intended to be so employed that as much of the product of the funds that are so expended by the people of the United States may

be employed in the interests of national defense. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has under its jurisdiction several transcontinental circuitously laid teletype lines. There are a great many radio stations in conjunction with it, and, jointly between these two services in the event of an attack, we may expect the best possible warning that can be obtained.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I might say to the gentleman that we took that into consideration in arriving at the conclusions on this bill. Of course, the gentleman understands there are many things about this program that are off the record and classified as military secrets. But does not the gentleman, with the experience that he has had with this matter, and I believe he is fully qualified to answer this question, believe that the continental United States gets more defense out of this one thing than any other thing that has come before us in the last several years?

Mr. HINSHAW. I can say this to the gentleman, and I am not repeating anything that has not been heretofore published when I say it, that tests made at Eglin Field Air Base of the United States Air Force have indicated that the B-36 when flying at altitudes of 40,000 feet or over can hardly be intercepted at the present time by the best type of interceptor aircraft that we have. These airplanes at an altitude of 40,000 feet will fly at the rate of approximately 6 miles a minute. It takes 26 minutes for the best fighter interceptors we have got, to get off the ground and get to that altitude. If you multiply 6 by 26 you will find we will not be able to meet an oncoming plane of the character of the B-36 at 40,000 feet altitude unless you know about it when that plane is at least 155 miles away from its target. Consequently, to make ourselves really more safe, we should know about it a great deal more than 155 miles away from any potential target. We should know about it, if possible, an hour away from its target, if not more.

Furthermore, we should be able to trap an oncoming bomber and know its direction, determine its altitude and its speed and the approximate target which it may have as its objective.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman well knows this equipment can be placed on that type of bomber.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, it can be placed on that type of bomber, but you cannot keep them in the air all the time. The equipment that the gentleman is providing in this bill is intended to be ground equipment, as I understand it.

There is a bill coming up right after this bill, in connection with guided missiles. There is considerable question in the minds of those who are engaged in this study at the present time as to whether or not a bomber of the quality and character of the B-36, or some others that are on the drawing board today, can be intercepted at all by human-

manned aircraft. It is quite possible that the only way they may be properly intercepted is through ground-to-air guided missiles likewise equipped with radar.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Of course our latest bombers, the Boeing XP-47, which flew 2,289 miles recently from Moses Lake, Wash., to Andrews Airfield at a speed of approximately 610 miles an hour, is really faster than most of our interceptors today?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is perfectly true, but that kind of a bomber is not going to go over the North Pole and strike the United States right away, because they do not have the range.

Mr. SHORT. It will take time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Unfortunately for the airplane, it consumes fuel at a rate that increases in proportion to the square of the speed of the aircraft. There are distinct limits both upon the speed and the range of the aircraft in accordance with the amount of fuel that can be carried, and so forth. But you will remember that back in 1934 there were three Russian aircraft that flew over the North Pole and landed in the United States. One of those planes landed in the State of Oregon. The other two landed in southern California, if you please. It is perfectly possible to fly clear across those poles within limits. The less speed, the farther you can fly. Of course, you may say, "We do not need to worry about the slow-speed aircraft," but if you do not know they are there, what are you going to do about it? They can be over the target before you have any idea they are coming. Hence the vital importance of establishing this great early-warning network, not only in the continental United States but in other parts of the North American Continent, and extending the cooperative efforts with other departments of the National Defense Agency into other areas than the actual continent itself.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. We were assured that there was very close cooperation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure there is.

I remember last year it was promised there would be complete cooperation in the continental defense command and in the seas adjoining the continental limits of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the scope and purpose of this legislation has been fully explained. I rise for the purpose of underscoring what has been said regarding the importance of the measure, particularly in strategic spots, like Alaska. After several years of study a definite plan and program for an aircraft warning and control system in the United States and Alaska have been finalized by the Air Force and reviewed and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

The bill authorizes the expenditure of \$85,500,000. This authorization applies only to expenditures for buildings, facilities, utilities, and similar expenses, but does not include the cost of radar and communications equipment. Authorization for those expenditures is already in the law, and the Appropriations Committee is authorized to act under existing law.

It has been pointed out that necessary radar and communications equipment to be provided will cost an additional \$26,000,000. Moreover, existing radar equipment valued at \$42,250,000 will be available for allocation for use in this radar warning system.

#### "WHO HOLDS ALASKA HOLDS THE WORLD"

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself in particular to the importance of this measure in connection with the defense of what is perhaps the most vital of all our strategic spots today—Alaska. A good many years ago the famed air general, Billy Mitchell, said that "who holds Alaska holds the world." How right he was and how prophetic was his vision.

There is no question today but that Alaska is woefully underdefended. There is no secret about that fact. The Alaskan Command has publicly stated that the Territory is presently vulnerable to enemy thrust and that the defenses are presently inadequate to repel a possible attack. General Spaatz has stated:

Provided with bases close to the Arctic area, an enemy could attack the most important cities of the United States, and, inversely, American bombing forces located close to the sixty-fifth parallel of north latitude could carry out reprisals of the same nature against the most important centers of population of any possible enemy.

That means that, operating from bases in Fairbanks, for example, enemy bombers could bomb most of the industrial heart of America.

The fall of China to the Chinese Communist armies, thereby bringing China under Communist pressure and Soviet Union influence, if not control, threatening to engulf the larger part of the Asiatic land mass, changes the complexion of the entire Pacific area and lays bare the weaknesses of our Alaskan defenses. A glance at the map reveals the fact that thousands of miles separate the California coast from the Asiatic mainland in the deeper latitudes. But the mainland of Alaska is only 56 miles from the Soviet Union, across the Bering Strait.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it is well to point out that the security of Alaska is the security of the great circle, the most efficient air route to the Orient. A further glance at the polar map shows that the Aleutian chain stretches along this air route toward the Kamchatka Peninsula, to Japan, China, and the Philippines. This main air route to the Orient uses Anchorage, Alaska, as an important base.

#### RUSSIA IS ACTIVE IN SIBERIA

In considering the over-all problem of defending Alaska from possible attack, it is well to recall that the Russians are thoroughly familiar with most of the airfields and installations in the Alaskan

area. During the war more than 7,000 lend-lease planes were delivered to Russian fliers at Fairbanks. Quite a large number of Russian officers and men were kept there during much of the war and others received training in the Aleutians.

We do not know what the Russians are doing with regard to their military installations in Siberia in the vicinity of Alaska, but we do have good reason to believe there is much activity in that area. We know that Russia's Eulenspiegel Field is only some 200 miles from Nome. We know that the Soviet base of Anadyr, on the Siberian coast, is in that immediate vicinity. We know that not since 1944 has an American plane been permitted to fly across that area, en route to Moscow via Alaska and Siberia. We know that the Russians now hold the former Japanese naval base of Paramushira, which is only 716 miles from the Alaska Aleutian chain. And we have good reason to believe that an all-out industrial-development program is taking place in Siberia, with stepped-up military preparedness activities being pushed ever closer to the Bering Straits. According to Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner, of the United States Air Force, the Russians across the Bering Straits are very likely conducting tests of men and equipment similar to our own experiments.

#### ALASKAN DEFENSE NEEDS

Now, in order to carry out plans for the defense of Alaska, there are three important considerations:

First. A comprehensive warning system, such as is contemplated in the bill we are now considering.

Second. The deployment of more troops, equipment, and airplanes to Alaskan bases.

Third. More adequate housing in order to make possible such deployment and in order to make more effective the best utilization of the radar screen in the Arctic area.

It is certainly important that we recognize the danger of relying too much upon the presence of radar and other installations and not forget the human element which is necessary to operate them effectively. The more we build up our Alaskan defenses, the more we shall need personnel to man and protect the equipment for possible defensive and offensive warfare.

Mr. Chairman, we can no longer think of Alaska as a sort of sentry-base. Alaska is likely to be a major base in any future war. There is every reason to believe that such a war would see planes and missiles sent back and forth across the North Pole. Arctic tests of such equipment, as the Air Force has announced, are going on in Alaska this winter.

#### MUST THINK IN TERMS OF EAST AND WEST

In our last two wars, the United States sent its strength around the wide circumference of the earth, east and west across the oceans in the traditional and conventional concept of a flat projection of our planet. That geographical concept is archaic and abruptly we are faced with the military need to reorient our thinking in terms of east and west alone, and to start thinking of the different pic-

ture which the earth presents looking north and south across the polar cap. In the last war, for example, we used Africa as a stepping stone to Europe, and Australia was on our route to Asia. But if we look at the world from the Arctic region, we see that Europe and Siberia lie almost next door—between North America and Africa, the Sudan, India, Indochina, the East Indies, or Australia. This is a whole new view of geography, and we must learn to think in these terms if only because the Soviet Union is assuredly thinking in them.

I am thinking of national defense plans in relation to the only great power with which our country could be forced into conflict at this stage of history. This is the air age and we have placed our hopes for peace largely on air power; in consequence, as part of our planning for peace we must turn our thinking toward Alaska.

I have spoken of possible attacks by air. But there is no guaranty that an attack would come by air alone. I was interested in reading a recent statement by Maj. Alexander de Seversky, a well-known aviation writer. In *This Week* magazine he singled out the Alaska-Kamchatka area as the only one in which, during another war, sea and land warfare would also be important. Major de Seversky cannot be accused of bias in favor of the importance of land and sea forces as compared with air power, and for him to make such a statement is significant.

#### ARCTIC TESTS ARE BEING MADE

But without attaching too much weight to any one commentator, we can all agree that the defense of Alaska is of the utmost importance. In recent months the Air Force has announced its testing under Arctic conditions of radio-controlled bombs and of the B-36 long-range bomber. These tests in Alaska, it is interesting to note, follow the tests given under artificially manufactured cold weather down at Eglin Air Force Base, in Florida. It was recently found—as just one example of many which come up during actual service tests in the Arctic—that Arctic duty produced an effect upon the tires not discovered during the previous tests at Eglin Air Force Base. Ordinarily, the tires of a plane upon landing are temporarily flattened and quickly resume their shape. But in the Alaskan tests of one plane the flattened tire froze and remained flat. These and other difficulties will be ironed out in present and future tests.

About a year and a half ago the Air Force announced that flights by Alaska-based squadrons had proved that Air Force units could fly anywhere in the polar regions during any season of the year. I am informed that already years of work, millions of flying miles and many millions of dollars, have gone into the work of testing material and personnel, observing and photo-mapping the Alaskan area for the strategic location of defenses.

#### ALASKAN COMMAND DOING GOOD JOB

The armed forces in the Territory, I believe, have done a good job with the resources and equipment available. The joint command of the services in Alaska has been unified, with Lt. Gen. Nathan

F. Twining, an Air Force officer, as commander in chief for Alaska, and Rear Adm. A. E. Montgomery as deputy commander. Army Alaska is commanded by Maj. Gen. B. L. Scott, an engineering officer, and the Alaskan air command, formerly under Maj. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, is now under Brig. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong.

The teamwork among these officers has been carried down the line to various bases and installations, each of which likewise has a unified command.

What is the present state, however, of Alaska's defenses? According to a New York Times dispatch of last February 14, the 586,400 square miles of the Territory, with its coast line of 33,000 miles, is defended by one antiaircraft battalion, a few B-29's—which are actually weather and photographic planes, about one group of Air Force jet fighters, one squadron of all-weather fighters, and a few naval patrol planes. There are no infantrymen and no combat ships, according to this report, permanently assigned to its defense. The military personnel of all services are chiefly members of supply, service, experimental or testing units, or staff and headquarters units.

#### HOUSING SHORTAGE IS ACUTE

The deployment of additional units, I am informed by the Air Force, waits upon the provision of additional housing. After the completion of housing now under way at Elmendorf and Ladd Air Force Bases, and the erection of temporary barracks authorized for Eielson Air Force Base, there will still be a shortage of space for 4,700 troops.

Those troops we now have in Alaska are in many cases inadequately housed. This was my own observation during a trip to Alaska last October, and I am pleased to have it confirmed by the New York Times reporter, Hanson W. Baldwin, who wrote on February 13 from Anchorage as follows:

Nowhere has this correspondent seen soldiers and airmen and their wives living in such squalid, ramshackle huts as pass by the name of houses here.

At Eielson Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, in the interior, an Air Force inspector recently reported that enlisted personnel were housed in Pacific-type huts—built for a very different climate—in most cases inadequately heated, poorly lighted, and crowded. The latrines were a long way from the huts, and at winter temperatures of 20 to 45 degrees below zero, their walls and floors stayed covered with ice.

The shortage of space—even after present construction is completed—for some 4,700 additional troops is based upon emergency living-space conditions of 50 square feet per man. It does not allow for expansion to normal peacetime quarters of a personnel already stationed there. Ordinary peacetime space allowances run from 72 square feet for privates to larger spaces for higher ranks; in Alaska, the average allowance should be something like 90 square feet per man, compared with the 50 square feet which is provided. And the Arctic is not a good place in which to cut the soldier's living space. In this long, dark winter,

and sparsely settled country, most of his off-duty time must be spent indoors. This means, in practice, that a soldier coming inside from temperatures of 20 degrees or more below zero, to a heated barracks, is confined there to a space 5 by 10 feet or less. This area is largely taken up already by his bunk. When he takes off the heavy parka, boots, and other outside clothing and hangs them up, there is hardly enough room left to turn around.

#### FAMILY QUARTERS NEEDED

Nor, Mr. Chairman, does the estimated shortage of barracks space on an emergency basis for 4,700 troops, which will still exist when current construction projects are completed, take into account the urgent need for family quarters for the men who are already there. There cannot be many areas in which this need is greater. Alaska is a long distance from the continental United States, and is itself an enormous Territory—stretching in length a distance about equal to the width of our country. It has less than 100,000 people and a handful of small towns and cities separated by hundreds of miles of wilderness. The leading towns are smaller than the military bases which are nearby, although their populations have already been swollen by the last war. They can offer very little accommodation to the soldier or civilian who wants to bring his family along. If you will imagine the most crowded boom town near the camps and war factories in the United States during the last war and multiply the shortage several times over, you will have a rough idea of the state of affairs.

At Eielson Air Force Base, which is some 26 miles out in the wilderness from Fairbanks, a town of about 8,000 people, the requirements for family housing are spaced to house 345 officers' dependents, and 1,282 dependents of enlisted men. The actual provisions for such housing now provide for a total of 16 dependents, in converted Quonset huts. At the other bases, the shortage of family quarters is almost as great.

Mr. Chairman, I have spent some time referring to the housing problem in Alaska. I saw some of it under favorable weather conditions, and I can testify the acute shortage applies also to civilians. The shortage has made it very difficult for the armed services to recruit the number or quality of civilian technicians needed. The bases are like small cities—for Alaska, they are big cities—each with its public utilities, streets, heating, telephones, and so on, to be operated best, most economically and efficiently by trained civilians. But capable technicians of the sort who are most needed can seldom be persuaded to leave their homes and families in the United States for civil service pay and dormitory life in the Arctic. I was informed that the annual turn-over of those civilian employees runs more than 100 percent.

The services have done their best to provide for all these needs with their available funds. The Air Force, for example, gives priority to Alaska in all its housing schedules. But it is costly to

house forces in the Arctic. Because of the need to import labor and shipbuilding materials from the United States, and because of changes in design needed in areas of permanent frost, construction costs on the average are two and a half to four times the cost of comparable housing in the United States. For example, cement delivered in Alaska has cost \$60 per barrel and in Seattle the cost is only \$15.

Mr. Chairman, funds should be provided with the minimum of delay to meet all the needs I have mentioned: first, for additional barracks to permit the deployment of additional forces, and as soon as possible to permit the men now overcrowded to spread out into a normal space; second, to replace the present temporary barracks—rapidly wearing out—which house 11,000 men; and, third, to provide family housing for an estimated total of 5,600 dependents and housing for civilian technicians.

#### HOUSING SHORTAGE OBSTRUCTING DEFENSE PLANS

All these shortages, the Air Force informs me, have combined so far to prevent deployment of forces in the desired numbers, to retard the training programs, to lower the morale of the personnel, and cause difficulty in securing enough civilian specialists. Thus, the lack of adequate housing in Alaska has already seriously interfered with national defense at one of its most strategic points.

Let us not be lulled into false security by legislation such as the radar bill, nor by reports of technical progress in planes, guided missiles, or other weapons which may be used in possible future battles over the top of the world. These things by themselves do not win wars. They must be operated, and defended, by men on the ground, who must have adequate quarters for life in the Arctic regions.

In the hands of an enemy, Alaska would be as frightful a menace as it is now an asset and a safeguard. We have only to remember our brief taste of such a danger during the last war when the Japanese obtained a lodgment on the Aleutian Islands. This Aleutian episode, costly as it was in life and treasure, was only a feeble slap compared to the devastating blow which the United States would suffer from the loss of Alaska in a future war.

#### ALASKA HAS BRIGHT FUTURE

Mr. Chairman, before concluding I should like to put in a good word for Alaska generally and its future. It has many attractions, great opportunities for outdoor recreation, and remarkable resources for industry and agriculture. One of its main drawbacks has been lack of transportation facilities. Alaska raises only 10 percent of its food. Its roads are limited and inadequate. Many of its resources have been exploited. But it is still a virgin country with tremendous possibilities for the future. I am hoping for ultimate peace rather than ultimate war, and I am sure that our present military investment in Alaska can some day be repaid many times over by the future growth and development

of this magnificent territory. There is no better place to build for the future.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in support of this bill, H. R. 2546, which is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force of the United States to establish land-based air warning and control installations, in the interest of our national security, and for other purposes, I speak briefly and yet emphatically and most sincerely for its unanimous approval.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of this House, I have sat at hearings on this proposal and, therefore, had the benefit and advantage of hearing all of the testimony of the expert witnesses who appeared before us in support of the bill's objectives.

As the witnesses testify, and as this bill is to be voted upon, I specifically call your attention to the text of the report accompanying this bill and to the fact, on page 2 thereof, that one of the functions of the United States Air Force is as follows, to wit—item 8 of section 6:

To develop, in coordination with the other services, doctrines, procedures, and equipment for air defense from land areas, including the continental United States.

One particular phrase in this item which I desire to emphasize to your attention is that the function of the Air Force, in developing equipment for land areas, is that it shall make such developments in coordination with other services. I am sure that the taxpayers of the United States are very much pleased at every point where they find that there is coordination with the other services, and, as a Member of this great Congress, I am particularly pleased that the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have repeatedly and clearly urged that there shall be unification and coordination between the services which are described as our Military Establishment.

I believe that the people of the United States will not be found wanting in a willingness to furnish all of the funds necessary for our adequate national defenses; but, Mr. Chairman, I also believe that the taxpayers of the United States clearly expect and anticipate that wherever duplication, rivalry, or overlapping of expenses or efforts for the same thing can be eliminated, without lessening the efficiency or progress of our national defense, those duplications or expenditures which so largely use the most of our tax dollar should be eliminated.

No doubt, in a peculiar way, and may I say possibly a personal way, I have been and am interested in the support of the worthy objectives of this bill, for the reason that my own distinguished son in his lifetime was a lieutenant in the Army Air Force, in the Aleutians-Alaska area, and he being a war casualty, I naturally remember more specifically some of the things he told me about the beneficent effects and results of radar, in connection with the Air Force's use of it in the Aleutians-Alaska area. I also remember his emphatic statement to me, the last time I talked with him, that our Nation must

properly and adequately erect, construct, and maintain what he termed to me as a "radar picket fence." Naturally therefore, based upon his expert testimony to me, through his many years' experience in flying in the defense of our country, together with the expert testimony of the witnesses before our subcommittee, I find myself being in the unusually satisfactory position of being in support of this bill. I expect and anticipate that every Member of this House will vote for it; it deserves the unanimous vote of all Members.

In closing, may I briefly say that during the political campaign, by the result of which I was elected to return to this Congress, having served previously in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I used a slogan of mine which was, "A safe and sound America in a world at peace." It appears appropriate for me to repeat that slogan here, today, for the reason that, as the world now is, there appears that there can be no safe America without this radar fence. It further appears that there can be no sound America without being safe from aggression and until the world settles down enough to realize that the world citizens must live together in terms of peace, if they are to live at all. Lastly, the world must live at peace, because, in the presence of the rapidly expanding development of technological discoveries, there can be no survival of civilized man unless there is world peace. I pray God that it may not be a peace which comes primarily as a result of world fear, but for the present and until there is actually, essentially, and fundamentally a peaceful world, our great Nation must remain strong enough, in a military sense, to do its fullest share to prevent a world catastrophe to civilization which would surely be the result of any ungodly, crazy aggression, initiated in the world.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish you and my colleagues to understand that my interpretation and the emphasis I place upon being militarily strong is that our beloved Nation must never be the aggressor; but must remain strong enough militarily to fulfill to the fullest our mission and responsibility toward world peace, which is our keeping a mental attitude and spiritual conception of our world relationships which dictate that we shall never be the aggressor with our military forces, but that we shall be and remain sufficiently strong to insure that there is a safe and sound America in a world at peace.

In conclusion, I feel certain that you will join with me in reiterating that we hope and pray that every resource within the strength of the United Nations organization will be given such latitude, force, and effect that through the United Nations organization there shall more speedily come a world status of world understanding and cooperation which will reasonably insure a fixed and enduring world peace, which shall make possible and reasonable a much earlier de-emphasis upon the need of military strength than any of us can now conceive. I pray God that this status of a safe and sound America in a world of peace shall be steadily in our minds, in our hearts, and in our prayers.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish and develop within and without the continental limits of the United States in fulfilling the air defense responsibilities of the Department of the Air Force such land-based air warning and control installations and facilities, by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads, and to provide for necessary administration and planning therefor, without regard to sections 1136, 3648, 3734, Revised Statutes, as he may deem necessary in the interest of national security.

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the above, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to place permanent and temporary improvements thereon, whether such lands are held in fee or under lease, or under other temporary tenure.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and when so specified in an appropriation act such amounts shall remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$85,500,000 shall be appropriated for the construction of public works authorized by this section."

Page 2, after line 20, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 4. The provisions of this act shall be subject to the duties and authority of the Secretary of Defense and the departments and agencies of the National Military Establishment as provided in the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2546) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 129, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. JOHNSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with regard to the late Senator Broughton.

#### LONG-RANGE GUIDED MISSILES PROVING GROUND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 128.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1741 is a companion bill to the one just passed. It provides that the Secretary of the Air Force shall be authorized to establish long-range proving grounds for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities within or without the continental limits of the United States.

There was no opposition to this bill in the Committee on Rules, and it came out of the Committee on the Armed Services with a unanimous vote.

I was particularly interested in an article which appeared in a New York paper the other day in regard to this very thing. The article was the result of an interview with Air Force Secretary Symington. The article reads as follows:

While we cannot predict the exact role which guided missiles may play in any future war, we must do all we can to make certain such a conflict will not find the United States lagging behind.

The Air Force's research and development program in guided missiles aims to develop weapons to aid the primary Air Force mission.

This primary mission calls for the maintenance of air power to defend us from aerial attack, to provide tactical support for ground forces, and to wage strategic warfare to destroy the enemy's capacity to wage war and his will to fight.

The possibilities of guided missiles became clear toward the end of World War II when

the Germans used, with considerable effect, the V-1 and V-2. We used radio-controlled bombs with effect.

#### MAY REPLACE BOMBS

Experts now estimate that within 10 years guided missiles may replace airborne guns and bombs. Within 15 years they predict we may have surface-to-surface guided missiles which can play important roles in tactical and strategic bombardment.

Since the war, we have conducted exhaustive research on all types of guided missiles. We are now beginning to develop selected projects which will produce high-performance missiles in various categories.

We confidently expect air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles will increase greatly our ability to ward off air attacks; that air-to-surface missiles and surface-to-surface missiles will be necessary to effective counter-attacks.

Air-to-surface guided missiles are being developed which can strike with high accuracy. The first, soon to be furnished to our combat groups, are bombs weighing 12,000 pounds or more.

#### RELIES ON GRAVITY

This missile, an improvement on our radio-controlled bomb, relies on gravity and can be deviated in its course by electronic controls. It will be valuable in support of ground forces where precision bombing is all-important.

Next will come self-propelled missiles which can be launched from airplanes flying beyond the enemy's highly defended areas. Powered by rocket or ram-jet and flying at supersonic speeds, the missile may be electronically guided in any of several ways. Designed for long-range strategic bombing, it will be ready for use in the next few years.

Our bombers carrying these missiles to the launching point will use for defense air-to-air missiles similar to those designed for our interceptor fighters for use in breaking up air attacks.

#### SEE 10,000-MILE RANGE

A time may come when surface-to-surface missiles will go as far as 10,000 miles from the launching site. Such a weapon, we feel, must be one of accuracy rather than one like the V-2, capable only of area bombardment.

It must be able to deliver a knock-out blow on a specific target if it is to repay the vast expenditures of man-hours and materials invested.

This Nation has the technical experts and the industrial capacity for leadership in guided-missile development and employment. Helping to achieve and continue in that leadership to safeguard international peace is a prime concern of the United States Air Force.

Our present launching site for guided missiles is only about 150 miles long, but within the present year the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy, will have missiles that will go beyond 500 miles. Immediate action on this bill is necessary so construction can be started on testing grounds for missiles already manufactured that will travel over 500 miles. It is predicted by the experts that within a very few years we will have missiles that will go as far as three to four thousand miles.

This appropriation originally was for \$200,000,000, but it was reduced to \$75,000,000 for the purpose of getting immediate action on the installation of these necessary proving grounds for the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side of the aisle on this rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1471, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill bears the unanimous endorsement of the national defense establishments. It bears the endorsement of the Office of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. It has been approved by the budget. It was approved unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It comes to you today without opposition that I know about.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, and equipment of necessary public works, either temporary or permanent, within or without the continental limits of the United States.

This proving ground is to be used jointly by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for scientific study, testing, and training purposes. It is a joint venture of the three armed services, because all services have a need, in varying degree, for such a facility. Moreover, from the inception of this project, each service has had equal representation in all phases of the planning.

In discussing this project, it would be desirable if we were able to predict exactly the relative importance of guided missiles in any possible future conflict. Unfortunately, we cannot at this time make such exact predictions as to the role which guided missiles will play in the future. The potentialities of these new weapons, however, were clearly indicated in the latter stages of World War II, when the Germans employed, with considerable effect, the V-1 and V-2 surface-to-surface missiles, and we ourselves employed radio-controlled bombs. I might say in this connection that the V-1, or buzz bomb, as it is popularly known, was not a guided missile in the strict sense of the term, because, if I am not mistaken, no means had been developed by the Germans by which its flight could be controlled or altered in any way to suit changing conditions, once the weapon had been launched. In other words, the V-1 was merely a pro-

jected but not a guided missile. I believe the same may also have been true of the V-2, a high-altitude rocket, which was employed with limited but nonetheless devastating effect in the latter stages of the war in Europe.

The weapons used in World War II, however, might be compared roughly to the aircraft used during World War I; they were of a crude and elementary character, but, nevertheless, their importance in the recent conflict is outweighed by their significance as forerunners of things to come in the future. Indeed, our experts in the field of guided missiles believe it quite likely that within 10 years we will be replacing present guns and bombs by guided missiles, and that within 15 years weapons of this character will have been perfected to the extent that they will have important applications in the field of tactical and strategic bombardment operations. These ultimate potentialities cannot possibly be realized, however, unless we pursue energetically the tasks which lie before us in research and development and operational experimentation and training.

During the hearings before the subcommittee which considered this legislation, testimony was received from Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman of the Research and Development Board, who gave the committee a very helpful description of some of the terms in daily usage in the field of guided missiles and the general problems and principles involved. Dr. Compton's remarks were of particular assistance in view of the fact that many important facts pertaining to this legislation must necessarily be classified for reasons of military security. For this reason, I believe it may be of assistance to some of the Members if I repeat to you some of the information which Dr. Compton furnished to us in open session. In that way I can be on safe ground, reasonably assured against the danger of venturing into those areas where security must prevail.

Dr. Compton has defined a guided missile as "an unmanned vehicle moving above the earth's surface, whose trajectory or flight path is capable of being altered by a mechanism within the vehicle."

By mutual consent, the services have further subdivided guided missiles into four categories according to the manner of launching and the location of the target. These are: Surface-to-surface, surface-to-air, air-to-air, and air-to-surface. A surface-to-surface guided missile, for example, is one which is launched from the ground or from a ship and is thence steered during its flight to strike its distant target, which may be an enemy ship or factory or other military objective on the ground or sea. An air-to-surface missile would be one launched from an airplane against a target on the surface of the earth, either on land or sea, and moving or stationary. Note particularly that we do not include ordinary bombs, shells, or bullets, as these missiles do not incorporate an internal mechanism to influence their trajectory.

The proving ground under discussion today is required primarily for the completion of research and development work on guided missiles with ranges

greater than 150 miles, for which no facility now exists in this country.

To further explain guided missiles as compared to conventional shells or bombs and at the risk of oversimplification, let us consider the action of these two types of missiles. The artillery shell or bullet is fired from a gun at high velocity. After firing, it is influenced only by atmospheric conditions and gravity. In both cases, accuracy of the initial aim plus prediction of atmospheric conditions and possible movement of the target are the factors that determine a hit or miss.

The guided missile, on the other hand, usually has incorporated in it a motor which takes over after launching and accelerates the missile or continues it at a constant speed for an extended period of time, thereby increasing its range. Various internal mechanisms may be used to provide guidance and control to the missile while in flight. These mechanisms are controlled in various ways by outside influences, such as by radio or radar, as one example. The missile may have some kind of seeing eye which automatically steers it to its target after it has come within a few miles of its objective.

By these means, a missile can fly a predetermined course to a target, recognize it, and make final alterations to its course, in order to deliver the warhead within the target area. All this will be done eventually at supersonic speeds to reduce the possibility of enemy defense against it. This oversimplified description of a guided missile is, in no sense, what we have today, but is what we are working toward. At the same time, however, I will state that none of the features so briefly described are considered insurmountable by American science, and all are in an encouraging state of development.

A test range is an area within which the experimental guided missiles can be tested in flight to study their over-all performance and the behavior of all their parts—wings, motors, electronic equipment, rudders, stabilizers, and so forth. By such tests, faults can be identified and corrected, adjustments perfected, and alternative methods of operation compared. Without the benefit of such tests, the manufactured missiles would be so unreliable that the money spent on their development would be largely wasted.

An important term that is used repeatedly in connection with test ranges is instrumentation. This term is applied to the integrated system of devices used at a range to acquire the test data. One function or element of the instrumentation system is called telemetering, which may be described as the transmission of data from the missile to the ground by electrical means. It is essential that the scientist who is developing a missile know exactly what is happening within it at all times. Telemetering data tell us how engines, control surfaces, and other mechanisms of the missile are functioning, and whether the missile is rolling, tumbling, or deviating from its course. These data are picked up at various ground instrumentation stations located at intervals along the predicted flight path.

In connection with instrumentation, I would like to use this illustration. You all know the instrumentation panel which is in front of a pilot of an airplane, which gives the performance of the motor, his compass, and all the details that he needs to know about the functioning of the instruments. It is by means of the readings on those instruments that he properly controls his craft. In a guided missile there is no pilot present who can see those things, but it is necessary to have that same kind of information. Therefore, the instruments are put in the guided missile but, instead of having the pilot in the missile to look at the instruments, all the readings of those instruments are sent down to the ground by some kind of radio control and are reproduced in instruments on the ground so that the observer there sees what is going on in the plane just as if he were sitting in an imaginary cockpit in the guided missile and looking at the instruments themselves. That is what is known as the telemetering device.

In addition to the telemetering receivers at each station, special electronic instruments are necessary to track the missile throughout its flight to continually indicate its position in space, as well as high-speed cameras to take pictures of the launching and early part of the flight.

At the conclusion of a flight, a study of the data thus obtained gives a complete picture of what happened to the missile during its entire flight. Even the simplest missile, made to test a particular component of the finished product, costs many thousands of dollars. The more complicated may well run into the hundreds of thousands. This reason alone makes it absolutely essential for both economy and success that a flight-test range have adequate instrumentation to produce the data necessary in the experimental work connected with the development of guided missiles.

The project for the long-range guided missiles proving ground had its inception about 3 years ago when the Guided Missiles Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recognized the necessity for a test range much longer than any existing facility; the maximum range at any present facility is 150 miles. The matter was, therefore, turned over to the Joint Research and Development Board which promptly established in the fall of 1946, the Committee on Long-Range Proving Ground, of which Brig. Gen. William L. Richardson, United States Air Force, was chairman. This committee consisted of representatives from the Army, Navy, and Air Force and was assigned as its mission the "examination of the entire question of a single, national, long-range guided missiles proving ground."

That committee determined first, that there exists an urgent requirement for such a facility and, secondly, as a result of its studies, established the necessary characteristics of an ideal proving ground.

As a result of investigation, it was found that a facility of this character would have to be located in a relatively isolated area for reasons of safety and security. It was found also that the ultimate development of the program would

require an eventual community of 13,000 inhabitants, consisting of 5,000 military and civilian employees and an estimated 8,000 dependents. Due to the necessity of establishing the installation in a sparsely populated area, it is necessary to provide to a minimum degree housing, shopping, schools, and other necessities of American life.

Testimony was received during the hearings before our subcommittee to the effect that plans for initial construction do not contemplate accommodating 13,000 persons. Only the minimum essential facilities will be included in the initial installation.

The required facilities for a long-range guided missile proving ground may be divided into three main groups:

First. A base area with suitable launching site, technical and administrative facilities.

Second. Instrumentation range at least 3,000 miles long, thoroughly instrumented by means of observation stations for the first 500 miles, and with impact areas at various points along the line of flight.

Third. A suitable climate for year-round operations. Existing guided-missile proving grounds are not capable of expansion in length to accomplish the task of testing missiles at longer ranges than 150 miles. Installations now in operation are those at White Sand-Alamogordo in New Mexico; Point Mugu and Inyokern in California. Even apart from the inability of these facilities to handle longer range missiles, a survey of the work loads of existing ranges by an independent committee of the Research and Development Board has disclosed that they will be saturated during the next few years. The services have agreed, therefore, that the long-range proving ground may be used to test shorter range missiles so long as this work does not interfere with the primary long-range flight-test missions.

For reasons of military security, the location of the proposed long-range guided-missile proving ground cannot now be disclosed. However, it has been ascertained that there will be no serious likelihood of hazard to persons or property, or of interference with private and commercial interests in connection with the test flying of missiles on the proposed range. The danger will be very small because every possible precaution will be taken. Means will be provided to dispose of missiles in the air, over a safe area, should they deviate too far off course. Normally they will fly so high as to be impossible of detection except with special instruments. From a safety standpoint they will be no more dangerous than conventional airplanes flying overhead, and from a nuisance standpoint they will be less objectionable. Most important of all, the test range will be located in a region so sparsely inhabited in the areas where there might be any danger that the hazard will be wholly negligible.

The need for a facility of this type is urgent. Experts in the field are convinced that guided missiles with ranges in the hundreds of miles and accuracies acceptable to the military can be de-

veloped. Their development is dependent upon the existence of a suitable range on which to test them. The guided-missile development program is one of our largest research and development programs in which the investment to date has amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars. If work was started upon the construction of this facility today, it would be needed for testing missiles ready for flight tests before it could be placed in operation.

Missiles with ranges up to 500 miles will be ready for testing during 1949, without a range of sufficient length on which to fly them. If the services are unable to test these and other long-range missiles at time of completion, the entire schedule of research and development will be disrupted. Certain other nations have availed themselves of the services of German scientists and technicians and are making vigorous efforts to produce guided missiles of intercontinental ranges. The absence of suitable facilities in this country could easily make it possible for other nations to forge ahead of us in the development of long-range guided missiles.

In proposing the project to the Secretary of Defense, the Research and Development Board recommended that sponsorship of the project be assigned to the Air Force. Although the Air Force will have over-all responsibility for the range, each service will be appropriately represented at the operating level. Moreover, section 5 of the bill enables the Secretary of Defense to change the primary responsibility to either of the other services should he feel that such a change would better serve the National Military Establishment.

The proposed project is vigorously supported by the Army and by the Navy. These two services have expressed the view that all the services will enjoy significant advantages as a result of intimate association with all projects conducted at such a station; moreover, it is felt that this method of operation will be most economical.

The Navy has supported the project since its inception, both with material and personnel, and has assigned personnel to duty with the Air Force. In addition, the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department is presently engaged in making engineering studies and designs leading to the construction of all off-shore facilities.

The proposed legislation, as submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, would have authorized a total expenditure of \$200,000,000, which contemplates the eventual cost of the project. Testimony was received, however, to the effect that the first phase, representing the minimum requirements to begin operations, will require an estimated expenditure of at least \$70,000,000 over a period of approximately 3 years. A figure of \$60,000,000 was mentioned during consideration of the bill in open session by the subcommittee. This estimate, however, relates to technical requirements only and does not include the minimum requirements for housing and necessary community

facilities. A complete breakdown of costs furnished to the subcommittee in executive session fully supports the estimated figure of \$70,000,000.

Testimony further disclosed the fact that no accurate estimate can be made at this time as to the ultimate cost of construction which may be required during later phases of the long-range guided-missiles project; the ceiling of \$200,000,000 in the bill submitted by the National Military Establishment appears to have been merely an arbitrary figure selected at the request of the Bureau of the Budget. In view of these circumstances, the committee believes it appropriate to limit the authorization to the amount which will be required for the initial phase of the project. In setting such a figure, however, it is imperative that a reasonable margin of safety be allowed to provide for contingencies in order to insure that there will be no fiscal obstacles to the effective development of this vitally important facility. Taking into consideration the difficulty of estimating the exact cost of construction of certain highly technical elements and the possibility of fluctuating construction costs, the committee believes it appropriate at this time to fix the total authorization at \$75,000,000, and the bill has been amended accordingly.

The proposed legislation has the approval of the Secretary of Defense and of all three Departments of the National Military Establishment. In addition, it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously recommends the enactment of this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job of explaining a highly technical and restricted subject. There is no controversy on this bill; it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services, and we feel that it should be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in yielding to the sole surviving minority Member from the great State of Missouri, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, being the only Republican Representative from Missouri is no new experience for me, for I was the lone wolf from that great State, the home of our President, in the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, and Seventy-sixth Congresses; but I assure you it was an honor and distinction I did not ask for then, and I do not particularly cherish, relish, or enjoy the distinction now.

You know the greatest compensation for being a Member of this body is the rare and rich fellowship which we enjoy with our colleagues. I do not think we should wait until a man dies before saying nice things about him, particularly when he so well and so richly deserves them.

I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to say that though I have had the pleasure and privilege of working under several different chairmen of various committees of this House, all of them fine men, I have never served under a finer, abler, fairer, more effective chairman than the present chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished and outstanding Member from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON. For over 36 years he has served his district, State, and Nation well in positions of high responsibility. Any person who can be returned election after election for more than a third of a century to the United States Congress has to possess many fine qualities. Through the prolonged and paralyzing depression, through the terrible and trying years of the war, and in this, the most difficult postwar period, the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, has been a great bulwark and stabilizing influence and inspiration to his colleagues who have worked with him.

Through his rich and long experience he has accumulated a fund of wisdom. Every member of our committee respects him for his character, admires him for his ability, and we all are grateful for his helpful cooperation. All of us benefit from his wise counsel and from his sound judgment. He is astute and resourceful. He knows men and how to deal with them.

Since I have been a Member of this body I can truthfully say I do not think there is any chairman who ever comes on this floor with a bill better prepared to explain and defend than is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. That is the reason all these bills we have brought in thus far at this session have come out of our committee by unanimous report. We have no partisanship in our committee because we are dealing with the security of our Nation, realizing that we all are in the same boat and we are going to sink or swim together.

This bill, of course, is highly important. The new weapons of modern warfare are terrifying. Pilotless planes and guided missiles, no doubt flying at invisible heights at supersonic speed, will be able to rain death and destruction from the sky. God forbid that we shall ever have to use them. While we want to keep ourselves strong on sea, land, and in the air, invincible to any attack from any quarter, I think we all would do well to work and pray for the cause of peace and do our best to create and develop a moral conscience of mankind whereby civilization shall not be destroyed by the instruments of our own hand.

As a member of the congressional delegation that visited the atrocity camps in the Reich 3 or 4 weeks before Germany surrendered, I visited a great underground factory at Nordhausen near Leipzig where the V-1 and V-2 bombs were being made, an underground factory with 33 miles of subterranean passages, comparable in magnitude and efficiency with the Ford plant at Willow Run or Boeing out in Seattle or Alcoa down in the Tennessee Valley. There we saw long assembly lines turning out those instruments of death and we saw the awful

havoc that they did at Antwerp and at London. We got there just in time. Those bombs, however, in the last war, were not under control after they were once fired. Their course and direction was limited from the spots where they were touched off, but now we are producing missiles that can be guided by radar, and in the course of their flight, can have their direction changed. Why, Nagasaki and Hiroshima were nothing compared to the scenes of awful suffering and indescribable misery that will be experienced in another global conflict.

We shall continue, as members of the Armed Services Committee, charged with the security of this Nation, to keep our country strong, but I think that perhaps we should put forth all of our efforts not only as Members of Congress, but as citizens of a great Nation and as members of the human family, to create a moral conscience in this world and not put all of our faith in "horses that run upon the rocks."

For our distinguished, lovable chairman, I want to say that each and every one of us on our committee love him, and we hope that the good people in Georgia will continue to exercise their hard sense and sound judgment in returning him to this body as long as he desires and in which he has served for over a third of a century, and to which he has made such a magnificent contribution.

God bless you, Carl.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have already had the responsibility of expressing myself in regard to H. R. 1741, which proposes the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles. Since this measure has been reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services, it is readily apparent that I fully support the measure. However, I want to take this additional opportunity to briefly voice my sentiments on the importance of the proposed legislation.

This is not a hastily prepared measure. On the contrary, it had its inception almost 3 years ago when the Joint Chiefs of Staff recognized the necessity for a testing range much longer than any existing facility. Even with the improved facilities which have been established within the last 3 years, we have no existing facility with which to test guided missiles at a range greater than 150 miles. We have been advised—and it is now a matter of public record—that guided missiles with ranges up to 500 miles will be ready for testing during 1949. Since we have no range upon which to test such missiles, we have arrived at the crossroads of our problem. We need to ask ourselves two questions: First. Is it in the best interest of our national defense to confine our endeavors to an improvement of guided missiles which have a maximum range of 150 miles? Second. Is it in the best interest of national defense to construct a guided-missiles range which will

permit us to exhaust all foreseeable potentialities of guided missiles?

I do not hesitate to endorse the second choice. We cannot remain static in the field of guided missiles at a time when it is universally known that our only potential enemy is making a maximum effort in this field. We must not only keep abreast of any other nation in this field, we must be the undisputed leaders. I fully realize that this undertaking will entail the expenditure of large sums of money, and I am as reluctant as anyone else to increase the heavy tax burden which our people already bear. However, I am firmly convinced that if we have any hope for a lasting peace that it is mandatory to maintain an adequate defense which necessarily entails the expenditure of large sums of money on undertakings of this character. When one considers the astronomical sums which our Nation spent in winning the last war, I believe the present expenditure is justified as an agency which will either help us maintain the present unsteady peace or defend ourselves in the event of another national emergency.

On that basis and with that hope, Mr. Chairman, I give my full support to the proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending before the Committee now is in accordance with recommendation No. 71 of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress. I desire to quote one paragraph of the explanatory matter accompanying recommendation No. 71. It says:

Physical facilities required for transonic and supersonic research and development of aircraft and guided missiles are so expensive they can be furnished only by the Government. The NACA and the Research and Development Board are preparing a coordinated program of facilities required in the national interest. Since adequate research and development facilities are essential for continued United States aviation leadership, this plan should be expedited.

Mr. Chairman, I should have to be in favor of this bill, but I must here express certain doubts as to the wisdom, let us say, of giving such high priority to very long-range guided missiles, and I do so in the light of the recent experiments I mentioned earlier in connection with another bill, the experiments at Eglin Field, Fla., which indicated the great difficulty that pursuit ships will have in the interception of high-altitude aircraft which may be advancing upon the United States. It would seem to me that the results of those tests would indicate quite clearly that a far more important program than the one now before us is the program of research and development in the ground-to-air missiles. I say that because with the increasing speeds and altitudes of aircraft carrying bombs which may approach the United States it is quite apparent that it will be necessary to have something other than manned aircraft to intercept them. We do now have in the primer stage, almost, a guided missile which can be sent from

the ground, guided by ground radar, to a certain point.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I point out to the gentleman that in the statement of Dr. Karl T. Compton before the subcommittee he indicated that under this bill provisions are made for four types of guided missiles—surface to surface, surface to air, air to air, and air to surface, which I think covers the point raised by the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree that that is part of the program, but I feel strongly that the important thing we have to consider now is the interceptor type of missile, much more so than the attack type of missile. The interceptor-type missile is about the only thing that can with certainty do the job of intercepting a high-flying, fast-flying bomber directed against the United States. That has been practically proven in the tests conducted at Eglin Field. I believe that while it is nice to know that you can send missiles 2,500 miles—we have never been able to do it yet, but we may—and it will be nice to know that when the times comes, the important thing today is to develop the interceptor type of missile, a missile which can remain under control until the missile itself, through its own radar, can make contact with an oncoming vessel, either in the air or on the sea, and then release itself from ground control and control its own path with an integral electronic computer system which will direct it to the point of interception, and there, by other means which were known during the past war, explode itself in the vicinity of the attacking airplane.

I hope and trust that the funds that are to be expended by the Research and Development Board will be expended in this direction, not to the exclusion, perhaps, of these other plans, but to a degree whereby such a missile may be perfected and placed in production in the shortest possible time. This is vitally important to the defense of our country and to the discouragement of attacks against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that amendments be in order at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted etc.,* That the Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, within or without the continental limits of the United States, for scientific study, testing, and training purposes by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized in discharging the authority given in the preceding section to make surveys, to acquire lands and rights or other interests pertaining thereto, including the

temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, in administering the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., Supp. 315q).

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$200,000,000 to carry out the purposes of sections 1 and 2 of this act.

Sec. 4. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are hereby authorized to contribute to the support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons to the extent they may deem necessary or advisable, including, but not limited to, the allocation for such support of funds available to them for such purposes.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense may, at his discretion, transfer and reallocate to any department, board, or agency within the National Military Establishment all, or any part of the authority granted herein, and, in connection with such transfer or reallocation, may transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment or support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$75,000,000."

Page 2, line 19, after "reallocate" strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of line 20, and insert "to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force all, or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 128, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include as part of my remarks a statement by Dr. Karl T.

Compton, Chairman, Research and Development Board. This statement was made before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee of the House on February 14, 1949. It deals with the subject of H. R. 1741, a bill authorizing the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles.

Dr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, since the research, development, and test of guided missiles is a comparatively new field, I will start my discussion by explaining a few of the terms that are in daily usage in this work. First, what is a guided missile? The currently accepted definition is that it is "an unmanned vehicle moving above the earth's surface, whose trajectory or flight path is capable of being altered by a mechanism within the vehicle."

By mutual consent, the services have further subdivided guided missiles into four categories according to the manner of launching and the location of target. These are: Surface-to-surface, surface-to-air, air-to-air, and air-to-surface. A surface-to-surface guided missile, for example, is one which is launched from the ground or from a ship and is thence steered during its flight to strike its distant target, which may be an enemy ship or factory or other military objective on the ground or sea. An air-to-surface missile would be one launched from an airplane against a target on the surface of the earth, either on land or sea, and moving or stationary. Note particularly that we do not include ordinary bombs, shells, or bullets, as these missiles do not incorporate an internal mechanism to influence their trajectory.

The proving ground under discussion today is required primarily for the completion of research and development work on guided missiles with ranges greater than 150 miles, for which no facility now exists in this country. There are other requirements for this facility, however, as will be brought out by General Richardson.

To further explain guided missiles as compared to conventional shells or bombs, and at the risk of oversimplification, let us consider the action of these two types of missiles. The artillery shell or bullet is fired from a gun at a high velocity. After firing, it is influenced only by atmospheric conditions and gravity. The airplane bomb, after it leaves the plane, is affected only by the motion of the plane at launching, the atmosphere, and gravity. In both cases, accuracy of the initial aim plus prediction of atmospheric conditions and possible movement of the target are the factors that determine a hit or miss.

The guided missile, on the other hand, usually has incorporated in it a motor which takes over after launching and accelerates the missile or continues it at a constant speed for an extended period of time, thereby increasing its range. Various internal mechanisms may be used to provide guidance and control to the missile while in flight. These mechanisms are controlled in various ways by outside influences, such as by radio or radar, as one example. The missile may have some kind of seeing eye which automatically steers it to its target after it has come within a few miles of its objective.

By these means, a missile can fly a predetermined course to a target, recognize it, and make final alterations to its course, in order to deliver the warhead within the target area. All this will be done eventually at supersonic speeds to reduce the possibility of enemy defense against it. I hasten to say that this oversimplified description of a guided missile is, in no sense, what we have today, but is what we are working toward. At the same time, however, I will state that none of the features so briefly described are considered insurmountable by American sci-

ence, and all are in an encouraging state of development.

A test range is an area within which the experimental guided missiles can be tested in flight to study their over-all performance and the behavior of all their parts: wings, motors, electronic equipment, rudders, stabilizers, etc. By such tests, faults can be identified and corrected, adjustments perfected, and alternative methods of operation compared. Without the benefit of such tests, the manufactured missiles would be so unreliable that the money spent on their development would be largely wasted.

An important term that is used repeatedly in connection with test ranges is instrumentation. This term is applied to the integrated system of devices used at a range to acquire the test data. One function or element of the instrumentation system is called telemetering, which may be described as the transmission of data from the missile to the ground by electrical means. It is essential that the scientist who is developing a missile know exactly what is happening within it at all times. Telemetering data tell us how engines, control surfaces, and other mechanisms of the missile are functioning, and whether the missile is rolling, tumbling, or deviating from its course. These data are picked up at various ground instrumentation stations located at intervals along the predicted flight path.

If I might interpolate just a bit into my prepared statement, I would like to use this illustration. You all know the instrumentation panel which is in front of a pilot of an airplane, which gives the performance of the motor, his compass, and all the details that he needs to know about the functioning of the instruments. It is by means of the readings on those instruments that he properly controls his craft.

Well, now, in a guided missile, there is no pilot there who can see those things, but it is necessary to have that same kind of information. So the instruments are put in the guided missile; but, instead of having the pilot in the guided missile to look at the instruments, all the readings of those instruments are sent down by some kind of radio control to the ground and reproduced on instruments at the ground so that the observer on the ground sees what is going on in the plane just as if he was sitting in the cockpit of a guided missile and looking at the instruments themselves. That is the telemetering device.

In addition to the telemetering receivers at each station, special electronic instruments are necessary to track the missile throughout its flight to continually indicate its position in space, as well as high-speed cameras to take pictures of the launching and early part of the flight.

At the conclusion of a flight, a study of the data thus obtained gives a complete picture of what happened to the missile during its entire flight. Even the simplest missile, made to test a particular component of the finished product, costs many thousands of dollars. The more complicated may well run into the hundreds of thousands. This reason, alone, makes it absolutely essential for both economy and success that a flight-test range have adequate instrumentation to produce the data necessary in the experimental work connected with the development of guided missiles.

You are undoubtedly interested in the question of the hazard to people and property, and the interference with private and commercial interests, in connection with the test flying of missiles on the proposed range. In the minds of the uninitiated, the danger element has been greatly exaggerated; the mere mention of guided missiles conjures up visions of death and destruction. Actually the danger in this case will be very small, because every possible precaution will be taken to make it so. The test mis-

siles will not have explosive warheads; they will have means to dispose of them in the air, over a safe area, if they deviate too far off course. They will normally fly so high that it will be impossible to detect them without special instruments. From a safety standpoint, they will be no more dangerous than a conventional airplane flying overhead; from a nuisance standpoint, they will be less objectionable. Most important of all, the test range will be located in a region so sparsely inhabited, in the areas where there might be any danger, that the hazard will be wholly negligible.

I have tried to give you a brief picture of a guided missile from the point of view of the scientist who is developing it, some of the terms used, and the essentials of a test range. We who have been associated with the guided-missile field from its inception are convinced that weapons such as I have described, with ranges in the hundreds of miles and accuracies acceptable to the military, can be developed. To develop them, we must have a range on which to test them. The need is urgent. Actually, the guided-missile development program is one of our largest research and development programs, and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of the results of this work are becoming dependent on the availability of such a test range. As so often happens, we will need this facility before it is in operation even if work were started on it today, as we are rapidly outgrowing existing facilities.

I do not mean by that that the existing ranges are becoming obsolete. On the contrary, I cannot visualize the time when we will not need the three existing smaller ranges. However, none of them permit expansion in length; and we are in dire need of a facility that can meet all of our foreseeable needs in the field of the long-range guided missiles.

I have purposely kept my discussion in general terms and left the presentation of detailed information to General Richardson. As already mentioned, this project has been critically studied by the experts of the Committee on Guided Missiles of the Research and Development Board, and unanimously approved by them and by the Board.

Thank you.

#### HOUSING AND RENT ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 138, Rept. No. 243), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in

the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COFFEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Greenfield Reporter.

#### PALESTINE REFUGEES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 139, Rept. No. 244), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 36) for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States for the relief of Palestine refugees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time this afternoon in order to present a few facts and make a few pertinent comparisons in the interest of getting the record straight.

A great many of our Republican friends have remarked recently that the Eighty-first Congress has been slow in getting any action on legislation. In order to keep the record straight, I simply want to point out that during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress 12 bills have been enacted into law, compared with 8 that were enacted into law during the same period in 1947 when the Eightieth Congress convened on January 3.

This record, Mr. Speaker, includes the first 2 months of both the Eightieth and

the Eighty-first Congress through the date of February 28 in each year.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the House passed in the first 2 months of the present session, exclusive of bills on the Private Calendar, 15 bills in addition to those that have had action completed on them in both Houses and have become law. In the same period 2 years ago the Republican House passed only seven legislative measures, exclusive of those written into law.

Among the 12 laws enacted in January and February of this year were those extending the authority of the President to enter into voluntary agreements providing for the allocation of certain scarce materials and commodities; legislation providing for export controls; for the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate ships. Other laws that have been enacted include appropriations for relief of disaster victims in the blizzard areas.

The promptness with which this Congress moved to meet the emergency in the recent western storm area reflects credit, I think, upon our legislative processes. Fifteen other measures passed by the House and sent to the other body during the first 2 months of this year included the Government Reorganization Act of 1949. That is the act which permits the President to bring about economies and greater efficiency in the Federal Establishment, and to put into effect many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Included also in bills that have passed this House and have gone to the other body is a bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, a basic essential in our foreign policy, a bill that has been called by Cordell Hull the very keystone of our foreign policy.

Other bills passed by the House and sent to the Senate include a bill extending the War Assets Administration, a bill covering the export of copper, and a bill covering cotton acreage planting.

All those bills referred to do not include numerous actions taken by the House necessary to the organization of Congress. Of course, both political parties had those problems. In the early days of the Eightieth Congress, when the Republican Party took over, of course they had to reorganize the Congress. The same thing was true when the Democratic Party took over on January 3 of this year.

My good friend, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], said a few days ago—and I have the newspaper clipping in my possession—that this was a “no-can-do” Congress. Evidently he was resorting to some fiction and not fact in making such a statement, or at least the chairman had not compared the record of the Eightieth Congress up through February 28 with the record of the Eighty-first Congress for the same period this year.

The record shows that this Congress accomplished more in the first 2 months of this session than did the Eightieth Congress in the first 2 months under the Republican administration.

Legislation is coming from committees and now scheduled with full programs ahead for every day of every week. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a tabulation of some of those bills. I simply want to refer to them so that the record on this point at least can be correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I might observe, before asking the question, that it occurs to me the gentleman is protesting too much. How many of these bills to which the gentleman has referred have actually become law?

Mr. PRIEST. There have been 12 that actually have become law compared to 8 up to February 28 of 1947.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman referred to the allocation of materials and other things that had to do with price control; that was just an extension of legislation passed in the Eightieth Congress, was it not?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was, but it was legislative action by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right, and then the legislation to which the gentleman referred, extending the power of the Maritime Commission to operate ships; that was just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress, was it not?

Mr. PRIEST. With some modification, I believe.

Mr. HALLECK. And the relief of copper from import duties; was not that just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. PRIEST. I believe with some modification; yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Those are three.

Mr. PRIEST. Those are three.

Mr. HALLECK. And the control of exports from the United States with some slight modification was just an extension of what was done in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. PRIEST. As I recall the legislation it would go perhaps a little beyond being a slight modification; it was almost new legislation on that subject, but it was one of the bills that has been enacted into law; that is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Included in the 12 measures to which the gentleman refers, one was the measure which the gentleman does not specifically mention, raising the President's salary.

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was one.

Mr. HALLECK. And did the gentleman include in the 12 accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress to date the enactment of legislation providing for the 4-day holiday for public employees?

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will just permit; I am happy to continue to yield, but I will read at this point each one of the 12 bills that have been enacted during the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress and follow that by reading a list of the laws enacted during the first 2 months of the Eightieth Congress. I believe that is the best way to get the record straight.

Now, as to the bills enacted into law during the first 2 months of the Eighty-

first Congress, they are shown by the following table:

**BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS**

Public Law 1 (S. J. Res. 16): Federal employees, holiday. Approved January 18, 1949.

Public Law 2 (S. 103): President, Vice President, Speaker of House of Representatives, salary increases. Approved January 19, 1949.

Public Law 3 (H. J. Res. 112): Appropriations disaster relief. Approved January 28, 1949, appropriating \$500,000 for emergency relief in Western blizzard area.

Public Law 4 (H. J. Res. 88): Railroad equipment, free entry, amend. (Merci train.) Approved February 3, 1949.

Public Law 5 (H. J. Res. 136): Appropriations, disaster relief. Approved February 7, 1949. Five hundred thousand dollars for disaster relief in blizzard area.

Public Law 6 (S. 547): Prices, stabilization of, amend. Approved February 9, 1949. Continues through September 30, 1949 authority of the President to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities which basically affect the cost of living.

Public Law 7 (H. R. 2402): War Assets Administration, continue. Approved February 21, 1949.

Public Law 8 (H. R. 1252): Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, amend. Provided that professional staff of congressional committees may be hired by executive branch of Government when such persons are terminated from committee staff. Approved February 24, 1949.

Public Law 9 (S. 492): Stamps, commemorative, Alexandria, Va.

Public Law 10 (S. 713): General Accounting Office, building, increase limit of cost.

Public Law 11 (S. 548): Export Control Act of 1949. Approved February 26, 1949, extends until June 30, 1951, the authority of the President to control exports.

Public Law 12 (H. J. Res. 92): To continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels. Signed February 28, 1949.

I have here a list of the eight laws enacted by the Eightieth Congress during the first two months, from January 3 to February 28, 1947:

**BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS**

Public Law 1 (S. J. Res. 3): Senate, employee, approved January 31, 1947.

Public Law 2 (H. J. Res. 57): Alcohol plants, produce sugars, approved February 1, 1947.

Public Law 3 (S. J. Res. 4): Senate, employees compensation, approved February 19, 1947.

Public Law 4 (S. J. Res. 24): Senate, committee, staff organization. Approved February 19, 1947.

Public Law 5 (H. R. 1353): National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, amended. Approved February 21, 1947.

Public Law 6 (H. J. Res. 114): Maritime Commission, vessels. Approved February 26, 1947.

Public Law 7 (H. J. Res. 121): United Nations, gift taxes. Approved February 26, 1947.

Public Law 8 (S. 568): Agriculture, foot-and-mouth disease. Approved February 28, 1947.

Those are the eight bills that were completely enacted into law on which the legislative process had been completed up to February 28, 1947, compared to the 12 I have just read.

I have here also, and I shall ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD, a list of the 15 bills on which House ac-

tion has been completed up to that time this year and the 7 bills on which House action had been completed prior to February 28 of 1947.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman from Tennessee, the distinguished whip of the majority party, is entitled to a vote of thanks for bringing the record up to date. I should like to call his attention to the fact that the Republicans made arrangements for an inaugural in January of this year which caused us a loss on this side. We have had to take that added burden but in spite of it we have been able to show a better record to date than the Republican Party did over a similar period 2 years ago.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the chief assistant majority whip of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I also call attention to the bills that have passed the House and are now over in the Senate. Two of them are very important bills.

There is the reorganization bill which passed the House in one day. I do not remember of a reorganization bill ever having passed the House with less than one week's debate. I remember the first reorganization bill that came up in this body years ago. It was adopted by the committee after 3 weeks debate, then recommitted. Here is a bill that passed the House in 1 day providing permanent legislation.

In the same week we passed a reciprocal trade agreements bill in 2 days. Ordinarily I should say that either one of those bills would take a week.

Mr. Speaker, this is all due to the very fine Democratic organization that exists in the House and in great part to the wisdom of the voters last fall in sending to this body close to 100 new Democratic Members who are the tops so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I have here a list of these bills. My purpose in taking the floor today was simply to get into the RECORD some facts. I was a newspaper man for 14 years before coming to this body and having been a newspaper man I believe in facts. A great deal has been said pro and con about the slowness of operation of the Eighty-first Congress and I wanted some facts in the RECORD to show what has happened and some comparison of what happened during a similar period in 1947.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as a part of my remarks a list of bills enacted and a list of bills enacted by the House but on which action has not been completed during both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OTHER BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, IN THE FIRST 2 MONTHS

H. R. 54: Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. (Awaits signature of President.)

H. R. 128: Agriculture, cotton acreage. (Conference.)

H. R. 164: California, Churntown Elementary School District.

H. R. 858: Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, amends. It would exclude from the regular rate of pay, for purposes of overtime computation, premiums paid for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work and for work at undesirable hours.

H. R. 967: El Paso, Tex. (private bill).

H. R. 1211: Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949. Extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to June 12, 1951, and eliminating amendments written into the act by the Eightieth Congress.

H. R. 1243: Hatch Act, amend, penalty. Relates to governmental employees who engage in political activity. Under the present law the penalty is automatic discharge. The bill permits the Civil Service Commission to fix the penalty.

H. R. 1401: Michigan, Mount Hope Cemetery Association.

H. R. 1998: Florida, Pinellas County, land description corrected.

H. R. 2101: Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Making \$44,000,000 in loans available to farmers in the western disaster area.

H. R. 2313: Copper, copper-bearing ores, exemption from import tax. Continues the suspension of import duties on copper for 2 years, until March 31, 1951.

H. R. 2361: Reorganization Act of 1949. Provides for the reorganization of the Federal Government.

H. R. 2632: Appropriations, first deficiency. Steam plant.

House Joint Resolution 84: Freedom Train, acquisition. Authorizing the Government to operate the Freedom Train for 2 years at a cost of \$2,500,000. Now awaits signature of President.

House Joint Resolution 85: Inauguration tax, admission tickets.

H. R. 4: Failure to bring a person under arrest before a committing officer within the proper time shall not render evidence admissible. Passed House February 24, 1947.

H. R. 597: Prevents disposition of garbage in Territorial waters of the United States. Passed House February 10, 1947, and later was pocket vetoed.

House Joint Resolution 27: Amendment to Constitution. Limiting Presidential tenure to two terms. Passed House February 6, 1947.

House Joint Resolution 122: United States Maritime Commission, Alaska Ocean Service. Passed House February 18, 1947.

H. R. 2157: Courts, limit jurisdiction. Overtime-pay suits must be commenced 1 year after date of accrual. Passed House February 28, 1947.

H. R. 1030: Continues in effect certain war excise taxes. Passed House January 29, 1947.

H. R. 1968: Urgent deficiency appropriation bill. Passed House February 18, 1947.

#### THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am not a little amazed to discover here today that my very amiable and fine friend from Tennessee, the majority whip, has

deemed it necessary to come down here in the well of the House and undertake to explain why so little legislation has been passed by the Eighty-first Congress. That he would deem it necessary to make any sort of explanation or comparison at all seems to me to get him very close to the point where he must have something of a guilty conscience.

I was not too sure as I listened to the interruption by the majority leader, my very good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], whether he was endeavoring to take credit for what had been accomplished or to commend the Republicans who have cooperated, certainly in the passage of the reorganization bill to which he referred.

First of all, in respect to the Eightieth Congress, I may say to my friend from Tennessee that for him to compare the Eighty-first Congress with the Eightieth Congress is to make a comparison with a Congress that did a magnificent job for the people of the country. I am glad to see that he apparently recognizes that, because he wants to put his comparison on that basis.

Now, among other reasons for my conviction in that regard is the fact that when the Eightieth Congress came into being and convened in Washington, it fell to our lot to put into effect the provisions of the Reorganization Act that had been enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. It was a tremendous job to shrink the committees from 48 to 19; to bring about the complete reorganization of committees; to staff those committees under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, and to carry into full force and effect every line of the Reorganization Act.

I have said before, and I say it again, that if the Eightieth Congress had not been a Republican Congress, the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act would never have been put into effect. Now, enough for that.

Let me say just this: In my opinion this attempted apology for the record of the Eighty-first Congress to this date is nothing more than a smoke screen to cover up the very obvious fact that none of the pledges made to the people in the last campaign, as to what would be done in this Congress, have as yet been carried out. Now, it would appear to me just as a bystander that over on the other side of the Capitol Mr. Truman seems to be filibustering his own program. I do not know how soon they will be able to move forward with the accomplishment of any of the promises that have been made.

Here in the House the plain fact remains that old hands are at the wheel. In other words, you have on the Democratic side in the Eighty-first Congress old hands with experience in the Seventy-ninth and preceding Congresses, who just moved back into the chairs they previously held and yet, in these upward of 2 months, as I said before, none of the significant, important pledges made to the American people have as yet been accomplished.

I hazard this prediction, too, from what I have been able to see around, that very few of those pledges are finally going to be enacted into law. I think if

you get down to it, that is the real reason for this attempted apology today. Certainly, no one of experience in this Chamber would otherwise get very excited about any one statement about a no-can-do Congress. Why, we took that criticism on our side during the Eightieth Congress. I sometimes think that over here you can dish it out but you cannot take it. I recall how you complained about the inaction of the Eightieth Congress. Well, we did not pay any attention to it. We knew that we could accomplish everything that we had promised the American people and we did accomplish that program. We got to it in an orderly way. We held careful hearings and the legislation was enacted into law. Yes, may I remind you again, the most significant parts of that program were enacted into law with more Democratic votes for them than against them.

**THE SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**Mr. HALLECK.** The generosity and kindness of my friend from Massachusetts overwhelms me. I have a slight feeling that he is getting ready to make a speech himself, and I hope he does. I hope he does, as I would like to hear him predict just what is going to be accomplished in connection with this promised program. Maybe he is going to tell us about the pension bill that, under this new rule adopted by the Eighty-first Congress, seems likely to come up next Monday although, as I understand, the Committee on Rules has not yet voted out a rule.

I inquired here on the floor the other day about whether the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my very dear friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] could tell us what the President's attitude is about that pension bill. The President has advised us about everything else that is up here in the way of a legislative suggestion. I had not heard anything about that pension bill, although I did see that yesterday, according to the press this morning, the new Director of the Budget was up here testifying in opposition to the pension bill, so I would assume that the President is opposed to the pension bill.

**Mr. HUBER.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. HALLECK.** I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

**Mr. HUBER.** May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana if he will urge the leadership on his side to support the so-called Rankin bill?

**Mr. HALLECK.** My recollection is that the gentleman from Ohio was one of the Members on the Democratic side in the Eightieth Congress who was constantly upbraiding the Rules Committee because they did not bring out more bills for the veterans, when the fact of the matter is that the Eightieth Congress enacted 188 different bills of direct bene-

fit to the veterans—one of the best programs for the veterans ever enacted by any Congress. So I am not to be dissuaded by the gentleman's interrogation of me in that regard. I am wondering on my part whether or not he is going to challenge the position of the Bureau of the Budget as the official spokesman of the executive branch of the Government in respect to the position it has taken on this pension matter.

The other day at that dinner held here in the District, it was reported in the press—I did not get an invitation to the dinner so I was not there—the President said that the Republicans in Congress were blocking the accomplishment of his program. The majority leader has just referred to the 100 new Democrats who have come here to swell the ranks on the Democratic side. Why, we Republicans are down to 171 Members. You have all the rest of them out of 435. You have a great majority in the other branch of the Congress. Now, how in heaven's name does it stand to reason that the Republicans are blocking the accomplishment of this great "pie in the sky" that was offered the people in the last campaign?

Speaking only for myself, I would like to believe that there was sufficient strength among the Republicans to block a considerable part of this program that has been proposed, because I happen to think that a lot of it ought to be blocked. And, again I say, it is going to be blocked because there are enough Democrats in the Congress who put the welfare of their country, its solvency, and the freedom of the people ahead of political promises or political expediency. They are going to see to it that a lot of that program is not enacted into law.

#### THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

**Mr. McCORMACK.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** Mr. Speaker, when I asked for the additional 5 minutes for my distinguished friend from Indiana, I had no intention of making any remarks, because nothing my friend said caused the spirit in me to move in the slightest, but as a result of the additional time the gentleman obtained he did make a few statements that did cause the spirit to move and prompted me to seek recognition.

My friend seems to place a great deal of emphasis on the liberalization of the rule. May I say to him that he had better study that rule, as well as some other rules, a little more and then he will not leave himself open to a devastating come-back in relation to a pension bill coming up under only one rule. Other than that, I have no observation to make. If he will confer with his friend to the right, the gentleman from Illinois might be able to advise him further. I make that suggestion to him out of the very extreme kindness of my mind and heart, as I do not want my good friend the gentleman from Indiana to make too many misstatements.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. McCORMACK.** I yield.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** I thought that we might explore that question of the rule a little bit further. Does the gentleman mean the Committee on Veterans' Affairs can bring up a pension bill at any time if they so desire?

**Mr. McCORMACK.** A general pension bill.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** Can the Committee on Veterans' Affairs bring up a bill at any time if they so desire, under the rule?

**Mr. McCORMACK.** It has a privileged status, the same as the appropriation bills or tax bills.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** I believe that probably the gentleman from Mississippi would appreciate that information.

**Mr. BROWN of Ohio.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. McCORMACK.** I must yield first to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who is on his feet.

**Mr. RANKIN.** The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is correct in saying that pension legislation is privileged. But since the eclipse of the Committee on Rules, we also have the right to move on next Monday, or on Monday 2 weeks from now, to bring the rule up on the floor of the House under the new rule, whether it is privileged legislation or not. On those Mondays we are permitted to move, under the rule, to call up the rule after it has been introduced 21 days.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** That is under the rule as amended this session.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** That is correct, but I was not referring to that. I was referring to something else.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** If the gentleman will yield further, he also said that the gentleman could bring it up tomorrow if he wished.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** The gentleman had better read the rules a little more. However, my remarks were not directed to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but were directed to my good friend the gentleman from Indiana, because I do not want to see him embarrassed in the future.

**Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.** I thought the entire membership would like to have the same information that the gentleman possessed.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** I do not want to see my friend from Indiana embarrassed in the future, when he says that pension legislation can only come up under one rule. The rules are there for anyone to read. An appropriation bill does not need a rule, if there is no legislation attached to it. A tax bill does not need a rule. If the gentleman will look up the rules, he will find that there are some others that do not need rules.

**Mr. BROWN of Ohio.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. McCORMACK.** I yield.

**Mr. BROWN of Ohio.** For the enlightenment and information of the gentleman from Massachusetts, as well as the Members of the House, the special rule to which he has alluded does provide that if the Committee on Rules fails

to report out a rule requested by the chairman of a committee having charge of the legislative bill which has been reported to that committee within 2 calendar days, then on the second and fourth Mondays of each month the chairman of that legislative committee may call up his rule for consideration. That is, he may call up the rule which he has submitted to the Committee on Rules, and the Chair shall recognize the gentleman for that purpose. However, in this particular case, the rule which would be called up under that special rule by the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would be a closed rule, providing, of course, that the Committee on Rules does not grant a rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has said nothing which is inconsistent with what I have said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] have five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, that shows the spirit of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the purpose of the gentleman from Tennessee was not to offer an apology, but to make the record straight to show what has happened to date in the Eightieth Congress and the Eighty-first Congress.

My Republican friends, in their desperation, have been making some statements which are rather far-removed from the true facts. It is only the Republican mind that could place such an interpretation upon it, when a Democrat takes the floor and presents the facts, particularly when it is uncomfortable to our Republican friends, that he is undertaking to make an apology.

I can remember last session. We did not attack the Republican Party at the outset because of its failure to function because we realized that it takes at the outset of a Congress at least 2 weeks for committees to be formed. We are all practical men and we know that. For the Democrats to attack the Republicans in the last Congress when they were in control for taking about 2 weeks to have the committees formed would not have been right. It would not have been fair and we did not do it. After the committees are formed, it then takes about 10 days or 2 weeks to internally organize and to get their bills assigned for hearings. So that the practical operation, when a new Congress meets, no matter what the Congress be, whether it is Republican controlled or Democratic controlled, we who have had some experience know that it takes from 4 to 6 weeks before a new Congress actually starts functioning. That is what happened 2 years ago and that is what is happening now.

Some of our Republican friends have been making some statements and speeches—even my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] made one down in South Carolina, as I remember, some weeks ago. Of course, I knew that Joe had departed from the role of statesman and was talking as a true Republican, attacking the Democratic-controlled Congress for having passed only one bill—a bill increasing the salary of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker. In that case my friend knew that bill had to be passed on or before January 20. Otherwise any increase for the President would not have become effective during the term of the present President of the United States, and we were all unanimous in having a proper increase in salary for the President of the United States. Both sides cooperated, but that bill had to be enacted into law, as I remember it, on or before January 20, when President Truman assumed his present term of office.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not say that my statement was not correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. I say the gentleman discolored it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In what way did I discolor it?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made the statement that we had done nothing, when the record shows we have done more to date than the Eightieth Congress, of which my friend from Massachusetts was the leader of the Republican Party and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman said in his South Carolina talk—

Mr. McCORMACK. Was it South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was South Carolina. The gentleman said there were two bills passed and one of them was an increase in the pay of the President. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. McCORMACK. When did the gentleman make that speech?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. At 7 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought my friend from Massachusetts retired about 7 o'clock at night. In any event, I meant what date? Of course, 7 o'clock is rather late for my friend. But what date was it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not recall.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman know that it takes 2 weeks when a new Congress meets for the committees to be formed?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does it not take 10 days or 2 weeks thereafter for the committees to organize? Is that not right?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I remember the gentleman stood on this floor and said you were going to bring

the wage-hour bill out in 1 day, January 18, and you have not brought it out yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but that is due to the fact that the Republican members of the committee are not cooperating. Any kind of a real extension of the wage-hour law, from 40 cents to 75 cents, will not come out of the committee through any assistance of any Republican member, with the possible exception of one. I hope there will be one, but I doubt it. In any event, however, the fact remains that the Eighty-first Congress, stating the record in response to the inaccurate statement made by Republican leaders, is far ahead. The final answer will be the end of the Congress. The people of the United States gave a vote of commendation of this Democratic Congress when they overwhelmingly repudiated the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress last November.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report and minority views on the bill (S. 135) relating to daylight-saving time in the District.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a report of the Soil Conservation District of Benton County. This report may exceed the limit a little; but, notwithstanding this, I ask consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

#### "THIS IS GREATER LAWRENCE" PROGRAM WINS NATIONAL RADIO AWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, rating third place among the hundreds of radio stations in the United States for outstanding public service, WLAW, 50,000-watt affiliate of the American Broadcasting Co. at Lawrence, Mass., takes justifiable pride in its achievement.

Official notification wired on March 6, 1949, to Fred A. Sullivan, promotion manager of WLAW, by Jerry Franken, radio and television editor of Billboard,

the Nation's outstanding amusement weekly magazine, stated:

WLAW has been awarded third place for clear-channel network affiliates in the public-service category of Billboard's eleventh annual radio and television promotion competition. Details will be published in the March 12 issue of Billboard. Heartiest congratulations.

Produced and directed by Chief Announcer Frederick P. Laffey, who is also a captain in the Military Intelligence Reserve, the program is heard every Thursday at 7:15 p. m. It is sponsored by the Pacific Mills of Lawrence, world famous as a producer of fine textile fabrics.

Stressing the voluntary and effective teamwork which knits together all the diverse elements into democratic unity, "This Is Greater Lawrence" is an inspiring program idea, expertly produced for reception in all American homes.

Communism will never divide us as long as we have such affirmative expressions of tolerance, of mutual faith, and of work-a-day fellowship as are revealed in this program of community understanding, a program which should be emulated by every radio station.

Lawrence is one of the most cosmopolitan industrial cities in the United States. Of its 84,000 residents, 22,000 are foreign-born. But there are no racial or religious tensions, thanks to the community spirit developed through constructive public-relations efforts of which Pacific's program is such a splendid example.

Representatives of organizations embracing all civic endeavors tell the stories of the roles they play in the life of this city. They tell of the accomplishments which have been realized toward the greater health, happiness, and prosperity of their fellow men. They plan for the higher goals of tomorrow.

Reaching out to the neighboring communities of Methuen, Andover, and North Andover, "This Is Greater Lawrence" weaves a living, vibrant pattern of democracy in action.

Ernest D. Walen, executive vice president of Pacific Mills; Irving E. Rogers, president of the company which owns and operates the broadcasting facilities; and Frederick P. Laffey, producer and director of the program—these are the men who merit the plaudits of their fellow citizens.

Hats off to an all-American public service from Lawrence, Mass.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILLIAM L. PFIEFFER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for balance of week on account of death in family.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 593. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

337. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for farm-type storage bins and the letters of compliance to the plan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

338. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting an additional list of copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Committee on Banking and Currency. Part II, minority views on the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1757. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2285. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works; with amendments (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 178. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 165. A bill to authorize

the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park; with amendments (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1731, a bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 36, joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; without amendment (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; with amendments (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2960. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 593. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 599. A bill for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard; without amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of John F. Galvin; with amendments (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; without amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; with amendments (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3356. A bill to modify the plan for flood control in the Ohio River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3357. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3358. A bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 3359. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3360. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Cheyenne River compact as entered into under the act of February 26, 1927; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

H. R. 3361. A bill relating to children born out of wedlock; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3362. A bill to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3365. A bill to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3367. A bill to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3368. A bill to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3369. A bill to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3370. A bill to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3371. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3372. A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents or employees of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation conducting a business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3373. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3374. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3375. A bill to authorize the construction of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 3376. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 526, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenues; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 3378. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 3379. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make and accept loans of road-building equipment; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3380. A bill to liberalize the delimiting marriage date in pension laws relating to certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the China Relief Expedition and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3381. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3382. A bill to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of \$30 to a taxpayer who voted during the taxable year at any election in which a candidate was to be nominated or elected for Federal office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 3383. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3384. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to suspensions of employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3385. A bill to require United States Civil Service Commission to establish regional office for State of Michigan at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3386. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3387. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3388. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3389. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3390. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3391. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3392. A bill to regulate the sale of reserved accommodations on passenger trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3393. A bill to create and establish an international university for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to provide for the course of study, management, and operation of the university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3394. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death while on 2 weeks' active duty, and for their

dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 3395. A bill to provide assistance for local-school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3396. A bill to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3397. A bill to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3398. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3399. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to more fully utilize the productive facilities of small-business concerns in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3400. A bill for the purpose of erecting adequate Federal office and postal facilities in Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 3401. A bill to include the Virgin Islands in certain titles of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3402. A bill to amend section II of the act entitled "an act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special 3-cent postage stamp commemorative of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 140. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Annie O. Brown; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. Res. 141. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study public-opinion polls; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to investigate and study the circumstances surrounding the making of contracts and leases relating to golf courses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 143. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the facts and circumstances relating to the obtaining of evidence in certain war-crime cases in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 144. Resolution for the relief of Jean Ness; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 3403. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3404. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Dugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3405. A bill for the relief of Vivian Newell Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3406. A bill for the relief of Leslie Fullard-Leo and Ellen Fullard-Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Ann Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3408. A bill for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3409. A bill to provide for the advancement of James Edgar Davis on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 3411. A bill for the relief of George Konditsiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3412. A bill for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3413. A bill for the relief of Alfred Baumgarts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

185. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the State Legislature of State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact legislation permitting the coloring of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

186. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will assure the payment of prices for farm products at not less than 100 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. Also, petition of Ralph R. Chapman, correspondent, and 26 other members of Local Branch 1225, National Association of Letter Carriers, Rapid City, S. Dak., veterans of World War II, requesting enactment of legislation to correct injustice of Public Law No. 134, enacted in July 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

188. By Mr. TOWNE: Petition of Hudson County Federation of Holy Name Societies, Jersey City, N. J., protesting against the outrageous procedure employed in the alleged trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

189. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Resolution of the Michigan State Legislature, protesting to the world the ruthless and unjust exercise of autocratic power in connection with the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

190. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Pinellas County, Clearwater, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, Eighty-first Congress, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, to whose kingdom of justice and love the future belongs: It is Thy might which hath made and preserved us a Nation. In the dedication of this quiet moment, perplexed by rushing cares, we would still all other voices that Thine may be heard.

We long to see the genuine spirit of brotherhood regnant in our common life—cleansing it from all that is unwholesome, sweetening every human relationship, composing the differences of class with class and nation with nation, delivering from the lust for gain or power or privilege which would narrow our loyalties and harden our sympathies. To this end we pray that Thou wouldst hear us for the outward growth of Thy kingdom in the world, and for its inward growth in our own hearts and consciences. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1741. An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3333. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.